FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 253 *31 December 1980*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Gen Petrov Hits NATO, U.S. Intention to Rearm AA 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Dec]
U.S. Counterforce Strategy Seen as Aggressive AA 3
[Semeyko in NOVOYE VREMYA No 50]
U.S. 'Hypocrisy' on Chemical Weapons Usage Scored AA 8
[Palladin in IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

NOVOYE VREMYA on Brezhnev's Persian Gulf Proposal CC 1
[Volskiy, No 51]
Weekly Assesses Madrid CSCE Results to Date CC 2
[Bezymenskiy in NOVOYE VREMYA No 51]
Zamyatin Discusses SALT, U.S. Ties, Poland CC 6
[Helsinki HUFUVDSTADSBLADET 20 Dec]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Kondrashev on U.S.-USSR Relations Under Reagan A 1
Reagan's Plans for Military Spending Outlined A 2
[Manakov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 24 Dec]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Arkhipov Receives MPR's Maydar, Talks Held C 1
[PRAVDA 23 Dec]
Japanese USSR Relations Examined on Hokkaido C 1
[Vdovin in PRAVDA 22 Dec]
Briefs: Trade Union Meeting C 4

SOUTH ASIA

American 'Military' Adviser Killed in Afghanistan D 1
[Blinor, Osipovskiy]
Japanese Socialist Youth Group Visits DRA D 1
Further on National Patriotic Forces Conference D 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Talks on Polish-USSR Economic Cooperation Held F 1
Polish Paper Cited on Relations With USSR F 1
Zagladin Comments on Poland to PAESE SERA F 1
[ANSA]
Gromyko Receives Outgoing GDR Ambassador Ott F 2
Knopp-Led MSZMP Delegation Visits USSR 14-20 Dec F 2
[PRAVDA 21 Dec]

WESTERN EUROPE

Communique on Frydenlund Talks With Officials G 1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]
Turkish Official Cited on Ties, Cooperation G 2
[Filippov in PRAVDA 22 Dec]
Briefs: Resettlers in FRG G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Nabavi Discusses Rumors of Threats, U.S. Reply H 1
Further Details [Levin] H 1
RPP Cites Arab Support for Brezhnev Initiative H 1
TISHRIN Cited on Murder of Syrian Official H 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Chernenko Addresses Friendship Rally, Meets Castro K 1
Rally Speech [PRAVDA 21 Dec] K 1
Meeting With Castro [PRAVDA 23 Dec] K 5

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

IZVESTIYA Reports Tikhonov Funeral Oration [24 Dec] R 1
Brezhnev Honors Dymshits, Shchelokov, Pavlov R 1
Kuznetsov Presents Awards to Leading Personalities R 2
Minister Named to New Agricultural Ministry R 3
[PRAVDA 21 Dec]
Sakharov Letter to Science Academy Head Published R 3
[Bonn DIE WELT 30 Dec]
Kirgiz SSR Paper Reviews Chernenko Book R 3
[Vasilchenko in SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 30 Nov]
Kunayev Speech at Kazakh Party Plenum Reported R 4
[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Nov]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Ekran Television Satellite Launched 26 Dec U 1
Salyut-6 Flight Continues to Proceed Normally U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Northern Group of Forces Hears Call for Vigilance V 1
[Khorundzhiy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Dec]
Yepishev Visits Brezhnev's Former Garrison V 1
[Moroz in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Dec]
Tolubko, Petrov Address Journalists' Seminar V 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]

GEN PETROV HITS NATO, U.S. INTENTION TO REARM

LD301211 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Dec 80 p 3

[Maj Gen N. Petrov article under the rubric "Old Year and New Year": "Balance of Trust Against Balance of Fear"]

[Text] The arms race unleashed by imperialism means that huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons have been created in the world today. According to UN estimates, current arsenals of nuclear weapons are approaching 1.5 million bombs of the type the United States dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Their total yield is more than 50 billion tons of explosives. These weapons could destroy all life on earth 15 times over!

But that is not enough for imperialist circles. The United States and NATO have begun to implement new multibillion-dollar military programs. Weapons systems such as the MX ICBM, the missile-carrying nuclear submarines of the Trident system, new heavy bombers and ground-, air- and sea-launched long-range cruise missiles are under development or are being commissioned....

The West's gamble on a long-term, mounting arms race and on underming in its own favor the prevailing military balance in the world is posing a real threat. Under these conditions the problem of military detente is becoming increasingly urgent.

The struggle for disarmament is the CPSU's principled line. This line has been consistently pursued since Great October. Its goal, as enshrined in the USSR Constitution, has been and remains general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are doing everything possible to secure, step by step, the limitation or prohibition of any types of weapons. In the process they proceed from the fact that an approximate balance of forces exists at the present time between the NATO and Warsaw Pact states and between the United States and the USSR. However, the balance of forces is at a dangerously high level and may soon reach a still higher level. To stop the arms buildup and then to lower the level of armaments without disrupting the prevailing correlation of forces and without detriment to anybody's security--that is socialism's realistic and sensible policy.

The socialist countries are taking specific steps. These include: The broad program of measures to curb the nuclear missile arms race adopted at last May's conference of the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee; the unilateral withdrawal from GDR territory of 20,000 Soviet servicemen, 1,000 tanks and a certain quantity of other military hardware; the constructive new proposals at the Vienna talks.

There is no type of weapon whose reduction or prohibition the Soviet Union has not stated its readiness to negotiate. The proposals already submitted by the USSR (and there are more than 100 of them) cover practically all types of armaments, both nuclear and conventional, and also the confidence-building measures necessary to lower the level of military confrontation. The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority and believes that approximate equality and parity is perfectly sufficient for defense needs. Nor does it have any intention of resolving any tasks by recourse to military force.

The only sensible road, and one proposed by our country, is the road of talks based on the principles of equality and identical security. Of course, the recognition and implementation of these principles are inconceivable without trust in relations between states--that is, without the good will to observe the assumed commitments to mutual concessions. If there is trust, there will be results. Otherwise the tension will persist.

The current leaders of the United States and certain NATO countries subscribe to a fundamentally different standpoint. Judging by their words, they too seem not to be opposed to the balance of trust and even recognize parity, and also the principle of equality and identical security, and the criterion for stability. However, their actions are at variance with their declarations. The concept of mutual restraint through deterrence is officially accepted in the West. On the basis of this concept, the maintenance of peace on earth and Western states' national security can be ensured only through a "balance of fear"--that is, technical military superiority over the socialist countries. "The peace in which we are now living is a peace safeguarded by force," J. Carter declares.

Under cover of bogus fantasies about a "Soviet military threat" and NATO's "military lag" behind the Warsaw Pact, reactionary circles are trying at all costs, by hook or by crook--up to and including the threat to unleash nuclear war--to disrupt the approximate equality prevailing in the world arena, to secure military superiority over the Warsaw Pact countries and then to dictate their own terms from a position of strength. The Pentagon is now reequipping at full speed its strategic offensive armaments and is seeking to increase the quantity, yield and accuracy of the nuclear charges and to secure superiority over the USSR primarily in this sphere.

Or take, for instance, U.S. and NATO plans "upgrading" Europe's nuclear arms through the additional deployment of almost 600 new U.S. Medium-range missiles. These plans should be assessed as an attempt not only to achieve quantitative superiority over the socialist countries in terms of this type of armament but also to ensure strategic superiority for the United States, since the Pershing II and cruise missiles deployed close to the socialist countries' borders would be the weapons of a U.S. first strike. This would place the Soviet Union in a disadvantageous position in relation to the United States and would substantially alter the strategic situation both in Europe and in the world as a whole.

If the NATO plans are developed, the Soviet Union, as L.I. Brezhnev clearly stated in Berlin last year, will be obliged to undertake retaliatory measures. And no one should be in any doubt about that. But as a result the military confrontation in Europe would be intensified, although neither side would obtain any advantage on the military plane. The approximate balance of forces would be retained, but at a higher level.

The United States' so-called "new nuclear doctrine" is also the offspring of the "balance of fear" theory. Essentially it amounts to placing the main emphasis on preparing U.S. strategic nuclear forces for a surprise preemptive strike against the military targets of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries. Simultaneously provision is made for the waging of limited nuclear warfare in virtually any part of the world where, in the opinion of the transatlantic strategists, there is a threat to U.S. interests. The criminal idea is suggested to the public that limited nuclear warfare is "humane" and the most "acceptable" since human losses in it would be reduced to the minimum.

Such arguments merely mislead. In brandishing the nuclear cudgel Washington is counting on intimidating the peoples of other countries and forcing them to come to terms with the unleashing of a colossal arms race. Also evident are elements of pressure on the Soviet Union--which, incidentially, White House figures do not conceal. They state shamelessly that their "new strategy" is intended primarily to frighten the Soviet Union even more. Only loss of sanity can explain such statements!

While forcing the arms race the U.S. and NATO leaders are at the same time shouting to the whole world about the "Soviet military threat." Thus a few days ago British Defense Secretary F. Pym, exploiting this myth and ascribing aggressive intentions to the USSR, again issued a militarist statement, supporting the NATO plan adopted last year to doploy 572 new U.S. missiles in West European countries, including 160 on British soil. [paragraph continues]

Pym tried to substantiate the need for the further buildup of Britain's own nuclear potential as well. He justified the conservatives' decision to replace the British missile-carrying submarines with new ones armed with U.S. Trident missiles, each of which is equipped with several individually targeted warheads. He also expressed himself--allegedly "privately"--in favor of Britain's developing chemical weapons.

What goal was Pym pursuing with his statement? He spoke of "the restoration of equilibrium," but to what equilibrium can he be referring? Equilibrium already exists. Thus NATO Secretary General J. Luns stated only a year ago that "if we take all types of armaments as a whole, then there exists approximate parity of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact." That is just one of the many statements made by Western leaders. There is evidently no question of "equilibrium" here. Pym needs to substantiate his own plans for an arms buildup and for fueling still further the exacerbated international tension prevailing just recently. But the "Soviet military threat" has nothing to do with the matter. It simply does not exist.

The USSR has never initiated an arms race. If it has had to create new weapons systems to strengthen its own defense potential then this has been merely an enforced measure in response to U.S. and NATO actions. "The Soviet Union," L.I. Brezhnev points out, "is resolutely opposed to the balance of fear. We favor the balance of trust. It is for precisely this reason that we propose so insistently to intensify detente, raise the level and enrich the content of international cooperation and seek persistently for an effective way initially to halt the arms race and then to disarm."

U.S. COUNTERFORCE STRATEGY SEEN AS AGGRESSIVE

LD301221 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 50, 12 Dec 80 pp 12-15

[Article by L.S. Semeyko, scientific assistant at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada: "Strategic Illusions"]

[Text] In expounding the thesis that "victory in a nuclear war is possible" in their article in FOREIGN POLICY magazine, K. Grey and K. Payne are not really being original. This idea was debated many years ago in the "very top" echelons of the American military and political leadership. It was also reflected in official documents--a fact which does not seem to have been considered by everyone in the United States. It is no accident that the opinion was often expressed in the seventies (K. Grey and K. Payne share it) that American nuclear warfare theory was in a state of stagnation. That theory, so it was said, did not dare to depart from the concept of "deterring aggression," with its emphasis on the threat of the destruction of enemy cities, at a time when the situation in the world was changing: USSR-U.S. strategic nuclear equilibrium had been established, and the means of waging nuclear war and the possibilities for using those means "more effectively" were constantly changing. "The ability to win an all-out war has been replaced as a national aim by the ability to prevent an attack." The authors of the major work "American Defense Policy" advised in its third edition. The compliers of a military-scientific council report presented to Defense Secretary H. Brown in summer 1978 formulated their idea even more specifically: the United States must be in a state of "readiness to fight, and not simply to prevent an extensive war."

The tendency to be guided by the idea of victory in a nuclear war had already started to emerge with increasing clarity in American military doctrine back in the first half of the seventies, although that doctrine rested officially on the idea of "deterring" or "barring" [nedopushcheniye] nuclear disaster. Only a few months back the Washington POST, among others, reminded us of the content of Memorandum 242, signed by President Nixon on 17 January 1974. This document indicated: "...the American nuclear forces' main task is to deter nuclear war." But the same memorandum did not exclude the possibility of U.S. first use of nuclear weapons. That is, of unleashing nuclear war. So how can there be any question of "deterrence"?

There is another important point. In approving plans for waging "limited" nuclear war as it was understood at that time, the memorandum set the objective of "achieving the speediest end to the war on terms acceptable to the United States and its allies." (Let us observe that this formula later migrated into the statements of Defense Secretary H. Brown. But what is meant by "acceptable terms" for ending military actions? There is scarcely any need to guess. This expression has always meant the achievement of particular political war aims, in other words definite success in the war. With regard to a generalized nuclear war, Memorandum 242 contains an even clearer form of words:"... to secure for the United States and its allies the most advantageous possible outcome from a war."

Hence it was hardly just, even in the mid-seventies, to accuse American military doctrine of excessive "modesty" or exaggerated emphasis on "deterrence." If the U.S. military and political leadership had been completely denying the idea of possible victory in a nuclear war, the various concepts for fighting it would not, it would seem, have been elaborated in such detail in the seventies. And this is not to mention Presidential Directive 59, adopted in the summer of 1980, with its much more clearly expressed gamble on winning a nuclear clash.

At the same time, the American public was presented with the aims of U.S. nuclear strategy as being "deterrence" and nothing but "deterrence"; there could be no winners in a nuclear war; U.S. strategy was oriented on a "second (retaliatory) strike" alone. The conclusion was that U.S. military doctrine supposedly pursued "defensive aims," so there was no point in expending manpower, money and resources boosting America's military strength just to prevent a war.

It was invariably stressed here that the "greatest potential threat to the United States" stemmed precisely from Moscow. That Soviet military doctrine was supposedly oriented not on "deterrence" but on "making war." That this was a "doctrine of victory" in a war, of military superiority; a doctrine of "first strike," of expansion and so forth.

The "Soviet military threat" is the main thesis in the propaganda backup for American military doctorine's basic tenets. It is precisely this thesis, according, for example, to Lt Gen D. Graham, a leading Republican Party adviser and former director of the DIA, that enables the West to prepare openly to "fight, survive and win wars against the leading communist power."

But how do all these stereotypes so habitual in American propaganda look in the light of Presidential Directive 59? How do the ideas expressed by K. Grey and K. Payne in their article published in FOREIGN POLICY accord with them?

First, it is perhaps difficult now to interpret American "deterrence" as anything more than a screen behind which to create the potential for the American strategic forces to enable the United States to win a nuclear war. By what method? By securing the potential to "defeat" the USSR, not including a "first" strike against its military targets. At the same time the United States must at all costs retain its ability to "recover rapidly" so as to be in a position to establish a "postwar world order" conforming with its interests. The ability to achieve these aims means essentially the "strategic superiority" for which K. Grey and K. Payne mil[illegible]tate. How is this to be achieved? By highly accurate "counterforce" and, as the author[illegible] of the FOREIGN POLICY article call them "counter-control" [kontrupravlencheskiy] nuclear weapons capable of destroying without fail military targets and political and military control system targets. Senator J. Tower (whose political influence has recently increased considerably) calls the strategy of using such weapons "countermilitary" [kontrvoyenniy], that is, directed entirely against the USSR's military potential. He believes that only such a strategy can "deter nuclear war."

If we analyze these premises, it is easy to see that they are essentially a copy of what has been ascribed to the Soviet Union in its so-called strategy of "achieving victory in a war." But if that strategy has always been regarded in American political analysis, military theory and mere propaganda as "aggressive," why is the United States now calling its new military-strategic concept "defensive?"

The authors of the FOREIGN POLICY article indicate that the strength of the U.S. strategic forces must enable the president to start a nuclear war for "enforced, albeit politically defensive (?!) purposes" [V "prinuditelnykh, khotya i politicheski oboronitelnykh (?!) tselyakh"]. Does not this tenet, which has much in common with the aims indicated in Directive 59, testify to the aggressiveness of American doctrine? K. Grey and K. Payne conclude that possessing the capability to win a nuclear war makes it easier to fight conventional wars too, if only because there will be no need to fear these wars if it is known in advance that a nuclear clash, if it comes, will probably turn out favorably. What is this if not an attempt to free the Pentagon's hand?

K. Grey and K. Payne are effectively placing an equals sign between the "strategy of deterrence" and the "strategy of waging war and ensuring victory." Essentially the same approach is characteristic of Directive 59, which directs the U.S. strategic forces toward destroying, by means of "limited nuclear strikes," thousands of Soviet military targets, political and military control centers and also key industrial complexes. This is the typical strategy of the aggressor calculated, albeit unrealistically, to undermine by surprise attack the USSR's very ability to resist.

The following fact should also be noted. The very concept of "deterrence" always was and still remains utterly false with respect to the Soviet Union. Because it assumes that it is the USSR that will initiate an attack and must therefore be "deterred" by convincing American nuclear strength. But where are the facts? The USSR has never planned to attack the United States--and that is by no means a propaganda aphorism. The Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed concluding an agreement on non-first use of nuclear or conventional weapons against one another. Such an agreement would eliminate the first strike problem altogether. But the United States has failed to respond to our initiative. What is more, under conditions in which "deterrence" is devoid of political foundation it assumes a different trend and begins to look like an attempt to "intimidate" the Soviet Union or an effort to put political pressure on it. This, of course, is a question not of semantics but of political meaning.

Second, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that in Washington's eyes nuclear strength is becoming increasingly a "rational" means of achieving foreign policy goals. "If American nuclear might has to ensure the achievement of U.S. foreign policy aims, the United States must possess the capability to fight a nuclear war in a rational manner," K. Grey and K. Payne write. The logic here is simple: If it really is possible to win a nuclear conflict, why not at the very least pressure your opponent in a crisis and threaten him with disastrous consequences? If he does not yield, make him capitulate with a "rational" hail of nuclear strikes.

All this suggests that some people in the United States are still trying to find a "way out" of the nuclear impasse acknowledged in America even in the period of American nuclear superiority. But it is a way out to "nowhere." The maintenance of peace cannot forever be dependent on strength which is constantly growing and becoming increasingly "promising" from the viewpoint of its use. "Deterrence," with its potential threat of generalized destruction, is by no means the best method of maintaining peace. But "deterrence" or "intimidation" using the "win" threat is incomparably more dangerous. In that case elementary political and military restraint could be lost, and the illusion of impunity could carry the world toward thermonuclear disaster.

Finally, a third observation. It concerns mainly the personal views of the authors of the FOREIGN POLICY article. In a letter to the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board K. Grey writes that the concepts of "the possibility of winning" and "the desire to unleash a war" should not be confused. So to confuse them would, he says, be unjust to the United States, as it would be also to the USSR. A well-founded observation indeed. It really would be primitive to place an equals sign automatically between "possibility" and "desire." The more so when the "possibility" itself is considered problematical in the United States, if we are to judge from the official utterances of Washington leaders.

All this is true. But at the same time we cannot fail to observe the evolution of American military and political views on this score. In the beginning (in the late fifties and the sixties) it was said that there could be no winner in a generalized nuclear war. Then, after U.S. acknowledgement of strategic parity with the USSR, assertions of this kind began to be mixed in with statements about the possibility of "surviving and winning" if Washington could manage to overtake Moscow in the military field, "squeeze" every possibility from new technology and modernize its nuclear strategy. K. Grey makes his own contribution to the development of the extremely dangerous trend which leads from acknowledging the possibility of winning a nuclear war not just on the purely theoretical plane. It is laready a practical concept, more clearly so because Directive 59 appeared immediately after a number of K. Grey publications on this problem. There may be no direct interdependence between them, but there is an unquestionable logical link, which testifies to a trend in American military thinking. And if Directive 59 is dangerous--and that is by no means a Soviet view alone--the quite unambiguous pronouncements and recommendations of the prominent Hudson Institute staffer, whose opinions are listened to even outside America, are equally so.

K. Grey's letter to NOVOYE VREMYA contains many sensible comments with which it is impossible to disagree: "Armed forces must serve the interests of a state's (defensive) foreign policy"; "nuclear war, however it is fought, is bound to entail millions or tens of millions of casulaties," and others. They are also to be found in the article published in FOREIGN POLICY. But we must not ignore the way in which they are interpreted and, above all, where the stress is placed: On how to prevent nuclear war from happening, or on the way to win it. Unfortunately the choice of the second variant essentially annuls all the concern shown by K. Grey and his colleague about nuclear war. To avoid nuclear disaster, in their opinion, the United States must ensure the "desired deterrent effect" and elaborate a "win strategy." "The United States," they write, "must plan to defeat the Soviet Union and to secure that defeat at a cost which does not hinder U.S. recovery from the losses incurred." The American researchers see the possibility of averting nuclear war in a race for superaccurate and superpowerful arms, in the elaboration of aggressive military-strategic concepts and in a "more effective" threat of force, rather than in the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union, in progress and expansion in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms, and in the strengthening of mutual confidence and implementation of the principle of equal and identical security. This is what constitutes the fundamental divergence between the American and Soviet viewpoints.

To justify raising the question of the need for an "American victory" in a nuclear war, the authors of the FOREIGN POLICY article stress that Soviet military strategy, according to them, is likewise oriented on a win for the USSR and its allies. Some American specialists refer to Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov's article "War Strategy" ["Strategiya Voyennaya"] which appears in the recently published "Soviet Military Encyclopedia ["Sovetskaya Voyennaya Entsiklopediya"] (Vol 7, pp 555-556). It says, in particular: "Soviet military strategy is based on the tenet that, on the basis of its policy principles, the Soviet Union will not be the first to use those (nuclear--L.S.) weapons. It is opposed in principle to the use of mass destruction weapons.... Soviet military strategy assumes that, if nuclear war is imposed on the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and their armed forces will have to be prepared for the sternest and most prolonged of tests. In that event the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist states will possess definite advantages compared to the imperialist states due to their just war aims and to the advanced character of their social and state systems. This creates objective possibilities for them of achieving victory."

If we compare this Soviet interpretation of the conditions for victory with that currently being propagandized in the United States, notably by the writers in FOREIGN POLICY, we can see the fundamental difference between them. In Soviet military strategy the question of winning is raised, it follows from the above quote, on the strictly SOCIAL [published in boldface], theoretical plane, whereas in the United States it is being raised on the strictly MILITARY [published in boldface], practical plane. The United States is prepared to be first to use nuclear weapons, while the USSR opposes the first strike. People in the United States talk about the specific, "effective" results of destroying quite definite military and economic targets and also control centers by means of highly accurate and powerful strikes--results intended to ensure a U.S. win. The USSR talks only about "objective possibilities" of victory for the socialist countries, and then only in the event that "nuclear war is imposed" on them. What are referred to are not military but definite social advantages (as we know, these advantages in fact played a decisive role in the Great Patriotic War victory).

Unfortunately, Soviet intentions are often interpreted very freely, to put it mildly, in the United States. Even high-ranking officials resort to this device. Thus the October issue of the BULLETIN of the Federation of American Scientists published an article criticizing the current Pentagon chief for distorting some fundamental tenets of Soviet military strategy. The article says that, when speaking in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 16 September, Defense Secretary H. Brown so abridged and dressed Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov's article that his audience formed a wrong impression of the Soviet military leadership's views about the question of winning a nuclear war. "In reality," the BULLETIN emphasizes, "the quotation from Marshal Ogarkov's article is not nearly so frightening if it is reproduced in full. It is assumed that the war will be 'relatively short,' and the 'objective' possibilities of achieving victory are created only by 'just war aims and the advanced character of the (Soviet) social and state system.'"

Thus we can scarcely acknowledge as well founded the attempts of certain American writers to present American efforts on elaborating the problems of an "American victory" as merely a response to a "Soviet challenge." The Soviet approach to this problem is fundamentally different--in both content and character. It is based on realism and not on strategic illusions that the course of social development could be determined with the help of nuclear warheads.

U.S. 'HYPOCRISY' ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS USE SCORED

LD311133 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 80 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed "Rejoinder" from "The World Today" feature compiled by A. Palladin: "Smokescreen of Lies"]

[Text] Scorning international laws and humanism, U.S. reactionary circles are demanding increasingly loudly the spurring on of the arms race by escalating the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Here they are using the favorite method of pilferers: wrongly accusing others. Their false voices (echoed, as always, by Beijing) are the basis of gossip about mythical instances of the use of chemical weapons in Kampuchea.

Striking hypocrisy! After all, if anyone has so far restored to barbaric methods of warfare in Indochina, then it is the inciters of the latest anti-Vietnamese campaign themselves. U.S. Congress admits that the U.S. Air Force dropped over 100,000 tons of poisonous substances on South Vietnam alone. The result: About half the forests and arable lands were destroyed and tens of thousands of people--including some transatlantic "liberators"--forfeited their health or their lives.

The facts show that the diversionary maneuver was undertaken by the slanderers not only to consign to oblivion the crimes they themselves had committed and to conceal preparation for the crimes which are still only being conceived. The smokescreen of lies also serves to conceal their present deeds. In the past few months the Afghan authorities have frequently confiscated from the hirelings of imperialism and Maoism examples of U.S.-produced chemical weapons. But there is no stopping the CIA and the Pentagon. The newspaper THE Kabul NEW TIMES reports that they have fitted out an area in Pakistan for testing poisonous substances. The saboteurs intend to cause epidemics in Afghanistan, India and Iran with the aid of animals contaminated with dangerous infectious diseases.

NOVOYE VREMYA ON BREZHNEV'S PERSIAN GULF PROPOSAL

LD310901 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 51, 19 Dec 80 pp 7-9

[D. Volskiy article: "Time Does Not Stand Still"]

[Excerpts] The international public welcomed the program for normalizing the situation in the Persian Gulf region, proposed by L.I. Brezhnev in his speech in the Indian Parliament, as a very important and constructive initiative. Of course, different circles reacted to it in different ways. Some expressed relief and hope, regarding it as a basis through which an extremely explosive situation can be rendered harmless. Others reacted with the instinctive caution of militarists toward peace initiatives. And others were at least forced to think by the Soviet program.

Of course, nobody expected the champions of neocolonial adventures to take up this program with enthusiasm. But does this mean that the USSR's proposals are advantageous to it alone and, as their opponents maintain, have a "one-sided anti-Western character?" It is indisputable that the Soviet Union is interested in having a normal and peaceful situation in the Persian Gulf region, which is located near its borders. But are not other states really interested in the same thing? For instance Western European countries, which cover 67 percent of their oil requirements by means of imports from this region, or Japan, for which Persian Gulf oil plays an even greater role. And indeed the United States! Though it currently exports only 16 percent of its oil requirements from there, it is possible that in future years this percentage will increase. So can it really be advantageous to the industrial capitalist states for tankers to be sunk in the Gulf and oilfields and refineries to blaze on its shores?

The palpable consequences of the Iran-Iraq war are indicative here. In L.I. Brezhnev's words, this conflict, tragic in its pointlessness, is beginning to develop into serious trouble not only for the participants themselves but also for their oil consumers. For it is no secret that U.S. imperialist circles are exploiting the conflict as a pretext for stepping up their own interventionist preparations in the Persian Gulf. Today it is a question of preparations. And tomorrow? The danger is increased still further by the fact that a military-political bloc--a kind of branch of NATO--is being knocked together in this region.

In light of all these facts, the statement made by U.S. Gen W. Rogers, commander, NATO Allied Armed Forces, Europe, in an interview published in the December issue of the READERS DIGEST, looks like a downright exposure for Washington. Discussing rather cynically the possibility of a new world war, he said: "The most likely region for such a conflict to emerge in is the Near East, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean."

Let us leave these forecasts to the general's conscience. In any event they help us to understand what a terrible turn of events the proposals put forward by L.I. Brezhnev are designed to avert. These proposals correspond to mankind's universal needs. At the same time the Soviet program for the Persian Gulf reliably guarantees the lawful interests--and precisely only the lawful ones!--of all countries, including the industrial capitalist states. Not on the basis of the expansionist "Carter doctrine" but only by respecting the sovereign rights of the Persian Gulf countries and by developing with them normal trade exchange can the West expect reliable oil supplies. And stable peace!

As for the Gulf states and peoples themselves, the Soviet program opens up prospects which we can say without exaggeration they have never known before. Implementing this program would provide them with the opportunity to choose for themselves both a foreign policy course and ways of solving complex internal problems in accordance with their own needs and traditions, and without any external pressure. [paragraph continues]

The plan proposed by L.I. Brezhnev envisages full and equal participation by those states in accords on the Persian Gulf and reliably guarantees their security and sovereignty. This is why the Soviet program has received an immediate broad response in the region's countries.

Of course, there are many difficulties on the path outlined in the Moscow proposals. But it is time to choose. And time does not stand still in the Persian Gulf.

WEEKLY ASSESSES MADRID CSCE RESULTS TO DATE

LD311031 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 51, 19 Dec 80 pp 12-14

[Political observer L. Bezymenskiy article: "Are Telesforo Fuentes Suarez's Hopes Justified?"]

[Text] Madrid-Moscow--The sender's address on the envelope of a letter which arrived at the TASS bureau at the Madrid meeting seemed familiar to me. In fact it belonged to an old NOVOYE VREMYA reader from the city of Las Palmas, Mr Telesforo Fuentes Suarez. He is a keen reader of ours and his letters have been published in the magazine. This time he asked us to convey his best wishes to L.F. Ilichev, head of the Soviet delegation in Madrid, and expressed the hope that the meeting will be successful for the cause of detente. The author of the letter wrote: "I would like the meeting to go successfully for the sake of all the peoples."

I suppose Mr Fuentes Suarez is not alone. In all the countries of Europe the Madrid meeting is arousing not only keen interest, but equally keen concern. It is from this viewpoint that I would like to look back on the weeks which have elapsed since 11 November.

There are several methods of calculating results. For instance, you can use the "running total" method, that is, add up the partial results as you go along. And the age of cybernetics and electronics has brought a new method: Taking a purely partial result (for instance, the results of voting in a few electoral districts), you can calculate the overall result relatively accurately. Alas, such methods can hardly be applied to determining the possible results of such complex diplomatic events as the meeting of representatives of 35 states which has been in progress in Madrid since 11 November.

Spanish Prime Minister Mr Adolfo Suarez expressed this view: The fact that the Madrid meeting has taken place is important in itself. Perhaps this statement was inspired by the dramatic events which preceded the meeting's opening (see issue No 47 of our magazine). But let us think it over: Can we really be satisfied with that conclusion?

In the course of the discussion of all-European problems the socialist diplomacy represented in Madrid has taken up a position aimed at ensuring that the meeting's participants do not turn the exchange of opinions into a "discussion for its own sake," but concentrate on the quest for realistic solutions acceptable for everyone. Not that anyone has objected to that (at least aloud), nobody has been bold enough to disavow Helsinki.

But what is denied the diplomatic Jupiter, is permitted the journalist bull [allusion to Zeus-Europa legend]. The West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, which carries considerable weight, entitled its article, citing a remark by one Western delegate: "The Spirit of Helsinki Is Dead." True, certain Western diplomats were guided by that slogan. Their argument went approximately like this: Yes, Helsinki was an important stage. But now the all-European and world situation has changed radically (not, they say, through the West's fault)....

One of the "interim results" of the Madrid meeting is precisely that when the participants, at plenary sessions and in auxiliary working parties, considered the question of the Final Act's fulfillment, whether they liked it or not the picture which emerged ran counter to DER SPIEGEL's categorical judgment. "The spirit of Helsinki is not dead"--that is the opinion of VORWAERTS, the organ of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and that, in our view, corresponds with reality.

This applies to all spheres of the Final Act. In the political sphere the intensive development of interstate ties and contacts at all levels and the conclusion of many agreements were quoted. The success of confidence-building measures elaborated in Helsinki was noted. In the economic and technical sphere the effect of the Helsinki accords has been so significant that it would take a whole article to describe. Thus speakers noted the success of the all-European conference on cooperation in the sphere of environmental conservation, convened on a Soviet initiative. The report submitted to the Madrid meeting by the UN ECE noted: "The conference was the culmination of more than 3 years of preparatory work, which began at the 31st [ECE] session in 1976, when the commission, in response to the USSR's initiative, asked the participating countries for their opinions on the proposal to hold all-European congresses on questions of cooperation in the sphere of environmental conservation, the development of transport and the power industry."

Finally, in the sphere of culture and humanitarian and other ties, which has long since been chosen as the favorite target for the enemies of detente, a significant development and improvement of cooperation was noted. And if there was any meaning in the part of the meeting's work that was devoted to analyzing the fulfillment of the Final Act, it lay by no means in attempts by certain Western delegations to adopt the pose of "prosecutor," but in establishing the realism and viability of the Helsinki program.

For instance, Kampelman, the American delegate, in his speech, started repeating the thesis--long since refuted by life itself--that Americans are allegedly "free to read" everything, while people in the Soviet Union are "not familiar" with the works of Western thought. In the United States, he said, "We are free to read both Marx and Lenin, and Franklin and Jefferson." "Do Soviet citizens have the same freedom?" The speaker asked.

Kampelman frightened no one with his tirade--least of all the representatives of the Soviet Union, which, as before, ranks first in the world as regards the translation of foreign literature. Here are a few figures which were made known to participants in the meeting: This year alone the Soviet publishing house Progress will publish works by 536 foreign writers, totaling 5 million copies; the Artistic Literature Publishing House will publish more than 100 works, with a total of 15 million copies. In all it is planned to publish more than 1,500 titles by foreign authors! For Soviet people the study of the best works of foreign thought, including Franklin and Jefferson, is natural and real. And how can Mr Kampelman prove his assertions about the allegedly free dissemination of Marxism-Leninism in the United States?

The all-European process deserves not threadbare propagandist phraseology, but serious analysis! When this was done, realistic prospects became clear--prospects which could open up in the cause of developing cooperation in many spheres. When demogogic methods were repeated--we have only cited one example out of dozens--this was clearly detrimental to the work.

It goes without saying that it is no use deceiving yourself. Reports sent out from Madrid by Western agencies and other mass media included as little positive information as possible. Even when Western delegates spoke in that vein, their statements were omitted. Yet all attacks on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries were carefully collected.

But here is a strange thing. The enemies of detente tried to give their attacks the appearance of principled adherence to...detente. Detente in Europe and throughout the world, they said, is indivisible. But an unexpected conclusion was drawn from this premise; If conflicts are occurring in other parts of the world, the Helsinki principles lose their force for Europe. This absurd rule was applied, for instance, to the Soviet assistance to Afghanistan, which was presented as grounds for the U.S. renunciation of political, economic and cultural cooperation with the Soviet Union.

In their speeches the delegates from socialist countries patiently revealed, in a well-argued way, the falsity of this construct. In particular, L.F. Ilichev quite rightly reminded the participants in the meeting that the concept of the "indivisibility of of peace" belongs to none other than socialist diplomacy. The Soviet Union has been and remains true to that concept, not only proposing, but implementing in practice the idea of extending zones of peace and zones of detente.

Whom do the new supporters of the "indivisibility of detente" from the NATO camp want to deceive? After all, it is not they, but the Soviet Union which has advocated the creation of zones of detente in Europe and elsewhere throughout the postwar years. Even when similar proposals have emanated from a number of Western countries--for instance, when Finland proposed the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe--NATO has said "no." And where was the present simulated enthusiasm when the Soviet Union proposed the extension of the confidence-building measures agreed in Helsinki to the Mediterranean and the creation of a nuclear-free zone there? According to the present assurances the West should have supported such a territorial extension of the detente process. But no: For Atlanticist politicians the Mediterranean is not a zone of detente, but NATO's "south flank." That is why, there, detente is being rapidly subjected to division and truncation....

However, these questions are useless. After all, in essence the Western concept of the "indivisibility of detente" pursues quite different goals. It by no means seeks to ensure detente, but leads to the indivisibility of tension, using the indivisibility of detente as a pretext. These tactics are used for the obvious purpose of hindering the adoption of practical decisions on the development of the all-European process. Thus in the course of the exchange of opinions a certain tendency was noted for the positions of a number of delegations to come closer together with respect to the convening of a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe. On his return from Madrid, Finnish Foreign Minister Vayrynen stated:

"There is, indeed, relatively broad unanimity that the Madrid meeting must adopt a decision on convening a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe...."

On the basis of this broad unanimity the socialist countries are stubbornly trying to find positive solutions. On 8 December Marian Dobrosielski, head of the Polish delegation, officially submitted for the meeting's consideration a proposal on convening an all-European conference on military detente and disarmament in Warsaw in October 1981. He went into detail on the possible program for the conference, calling on the delegates to discuss such an important proposal constructively.

But this is up against a "no" from the American representatives, who assert that the principle of the indivisibility of detente allegedly does not permit the adoption of disarmament measures in Europe while conflicts continue in other parts of the world. There are similar objections to the development of economic ties, in particular to the convening of an all-European energy conference. Yet a significant number of NATO countries and neutral Western countries are in favor of such a conference!

It is no accident that the Washington POST noted recently that the Carter administration "will not try to achieve anything new" in Madrid. Of course, if this method is adhered to, it will be hard for the meeting to justify the hopes pinned on it.

The events which have occurred in Madrid in recent weeks have been a vivid illustration of the aims pursued by the enemies of all-European cooperation. The fact is that the Madrid meeting has, as it were, several "levels." One could be called the diplomatic level: On this level there are debates and the exchange of opinions and proposals. However, as the Belgrade experience showed, through the efforts of certain Western delegations the diplomatic level is used for cheap propaganda. It thereby descends straight to the propaganda level, which leads to the devaluation of the very idea of meetings like the Madrid meeting.

Take, for instance, the human rights issue, so attractive to Western propaganda. As might have been expected, it again became the subject of debates, including debates at the meeting itself. But as before, these debates revealed the fundamental weakness of those who try to make the human rights question the subject of attacks on socialist countries. This weakness was defined quite well by Bruno Kreisky, vice president of the Socialist International, speaking at its congress in Madrid. He observed that Western politicians are often "blind" when it is a question of ensuring human rights in countries politically close to them.

Perhaps that is how one can describe the stance adopted by the head of the U.S. delegation, who stated grandiloquently that "U.S. history in the implementation of these principles arouses in us a sense of pride.... We are free enough to recognize our shortcomings." But he did not say one word about the "shortcomings" themselves, which are innumerable! Then he devoted more than three pages of his speech to imaginary human rights violations in socialist countries...!

"Special" propaganda measures were used to back up this stance. The chief role in implementing these measures was assigned to persons who for some time have enjoyed unusual attention from the Western press. So-called "dissidents" who had left their countries or been thrown out of them rushed to Madrid. Envoys of overtly anti-Soviet organizations also hurried there.

Actually there was not that many of them. But, with the help of certain mass information organs, they wanted to make out that Madrid is full of them. An FRG television correspondent told me:

"We ourselves are to blame for that. Without television, surely these people would not have arranged their meetings?"

But when Irish figures gave a press conference in Madrid to speak of Britian's human rights violations in Northern Ireland, not a word about this appeared in the press. The press also ignored a press conference given in the Spanish capital by religious figures from the Soviet Union. Not a word was reported on the conference of nongovernmental organizations, which came out in favor of convening a conference on military detente. Mr Fuentes Suarez obviously had that peculiarity in mind in his letter when he expressed regret that "the mass media here are very tendentious."

Naturally, many of the journalists (and delegation members) working in Madrid are operating in a kind of "microclimate."

The daily, intensive rhythm of the sittings and the practical questions which keep arising occupy not only the day, but the evening and sometimes the night. One can only wonder at the patience of most of the participants in the meeting, engaged in their complex, responsible task. But the Madrid meeting is not isolated from the world. On the contrary: It acquires its real significance only in the context of the overall world situation.

A number of events which have occurred in the world in the last few weeks have confirmed the urgency of the tasks facing the meeting's participants. The recent meeting of leading figures from Warsaw Pact states reasserted the socialist countries' desire to achieve success in Madrid. Unfortunately not everything helps in this respect--suffice it to recall NATO's recent decisions! But the tasks remain. And although a break in the work is approaching, which in accordance with the agenda adopted will last from 20 December this year to 26 January 1981, the Madrid meeting remains, so to speak, "on the agenda" of world politics.

The responsibility of the delegations from 35 countries, who still face a long spell of work in Madrid's Palace of Congresses, is all the greater. It would be unforgivable to miss this opportunity to continue the all-European detente process. The hopes entertained by Telesforo Fuentes Suarez must be justified.

ZAMYATIN DISCUSSES SALT, U.S. TIES, POLAND

LD311001 Helsinki HUFUVDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 20 Dec 80 p 7

[R.O. report: "Zamyatin: "Bitter Experience of Inimical Governments"]

[Text] "Although the Soviet Union does not want to proclaim any areas as 'spheres of vital interest'--which is what the United States is fond of doing--we cannot remain indifferent to the fact that attempts are made to form unfriendly governments on our borders, be it in the south, west or east."

"We have bitter experience of this kind of thing from the period before World War II," Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs Commission member Leonid Zamyatin stressed, when he addressed an unofficial luncheon meeting of the Paasikivi Society on 19 December.

Zamyatin gave a broad expose of U.S.-Soviet relations. He gave a similar lecture in Helsinki at the same time last year. Then he attacked the Western alliance's position on the so-called Eurostrategic arms. This time Zamyatin's message seemed more pessimistic.

Concerning the presidential changeover in the United States, he said that Carter perhaps gave rise to more speculation than Reagan does.

"It is generally said that Carter's policy was unpredictable and impulsive. However, at present it is only possible to guess how the new administration will work. The real political platform will only be shaped after Reagan's inauguration on 20 January."

Zamyatin pointed out that he himself did not expect any miracle from the changeover, but he believed that commonsense would prevail in U.S. policy. There are many states which are hoping for this, including many in Europe.

"The politics of power and pressure cannot give the United States, as little as any other state, any advantages."

Despite the fact that it took 7 years to negotiate the SALT II treaty and that it is a well-balanced whole, its opponents were talking about its renegotiation even under Carter. It does not violate the principle of balanced security. It was approved by both the Ford and Carter administrations.

"We are certain that the SALT II agreement is sufficient for the circumstances prevailing today," Zamyatin said. "If the agreement is ratified it would lead to the possibility of a real reduction in the most dangerous arms."

SALT II is as necessary for the United States as it is for the Soviet Union. U.S. experts have calculated that the first SALT agreement saved the United States $60 billion; such advantages cannot only be measured in dollars.

The SALT process advanced by stages. When one is finished the next begins. We consider that this stage in the SALT II process is now completed.

Leonid Zamyatin touched only briefly, on the CSCE conference in Madrid, pointing out that there was a general wish that it might lead to a European disarmament conference.

When asked if the Soviet Union had faith in the Poles' ability to solve their own internal problems, Zamyatin said that the Warsaw Pact nations had collectively expressed their faith in the Poles' ability. These countries have also expressed their conviction that the economic and social problems that have arisen in the country can be solved under Polish leadership and on the basis of a socialist Poland.

"In certain Western countries demands are being made that others show restraint. But if they restrained themselves then they would give the Poles the chance to solve their economic problems by themselves." Polish leaders have themselves indicated the extent of the Soviet economic aid to the country.

"I know that the Polish people expect other countries also to act in the same way," Zamyatin said, and added: "The economic and social problems now affecting Poland could hit any other country."

"Commonsense is needed to solve the problems in Poland. In this respect we rely on the Polish leaders' abilities."

In his address Leonid Zamyatin pointed out that historical experience shows that of the nuclear powers the United States and the Soviet Union bear the greatest responsibility for what happens in the world.

"If we ask the reason for the present situation, and why Soviet-U.S. relations are characterized by confrontation, why disagreement has arisen on questions in which agreement had already been reached and which offered certain mutual advantages--both economic and political--the answer must be sought in the fact that a clear shift in U.S. policy took place during Carter's term of office."

There have also been shifts in U.S. policy in the past, but in the last few years U.S. leaders have in general gone in for a rearmament line which conflicts with detente.

Unfortunately there is much in Washington's current policy which is dangerous and causes concern.

Zamyatin made it plain that the Soviet Union does not consider the United States to have respected what had been agreed upon and he made special mention of the negotiations in Geneva on European strategic arms limitation. There is the aspiration within NATO of disturbing the present approximate balance.

"The mere fact that there has been an understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union on matters of principle has always had a stabilizing effect on the international situation. In difficult times it has always given us the possibility of acting in such a way as to halt a dangerous development trend. This happened in the Middle East in 1978, for example."

"The objective truth is that we must talk to each other the whole time, and also talk about a large number of questions, whether they are bilateral questions, international ones, or concern disarmament."

"We live on the same planet and cannot push each other off. A certain level of understanding must be sought in U.S.-Soviet relations, a willingness to understand on the part of both parties. We must prevent confrontation through negotiations," Leonid Zamyatin pointed out.

KONDRASHEV ON U.S.-USSR RELATIONS UNDER REAGAN

LD310200 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Stanislav Kondrashev commentary]

[Text] In the present precarious transitional period crowning the precarious year of elections, the public is turning to the president-elect. He neither reigns nor governs yet. He is leaving behind numerous election promises and is preparing to become a practical American policymaker. Ronald Reagan is less inclined to make various pronouncements, apparently not wanting to stand in the way of his predecessor and fearing to commit himself by premature declarations.

Of course, there is no shortage of advice given to the man who will soon step into the Oval Room of the White House. The weekly U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT for example, feels that Ronald Reagan and his secretary of state, Alexander Haig, will profoundly change the country's foreign policy. It thinks they will lay stress on United States military might and toughness in relations with Russia. The magazine predicts that linkage will again become fashionable in relations with Russia; the general Soviet policy line in the world will affect Washington's line on trade and disarmament talks. I could go on retelling the article, but I think you notice by now that it only repeats old attitudes and views that never proved effective in relations with Moscow. These views are spoken of now with the persistent hope that they will prove correct this time.

In essence this is an attempt to return to cold war times, to deliberate confrontation and to a policy practiced before the era of relaxation, a policy that has proved to be totally ineffective.

The Reagan administration that hasn't come into office yet cannot be responsible for the forecasts and recommendations of any magazine no matter how informed and influential it might be. But still I want to make one point: During a kind of American interregnum, when one president has practically lost his power and the other is not in power yet, American observers tend to ascribe some supernatural qualities to the new president. However, there is an example of a completely opposite nature. The President stepping down from the scene has shown to the whole world how much the power of an American head of state is limited by objective conditions. There is no need to say that no matter what his intentions are, a President should realistically view the situation in the world and his powers.

It is a dangerous though old tradition in America for every new president to feel himself a god, building the world anew. And every American president comes to see that his omnipotence is imaginary and fails to change the world. There is nothing more dangerous at such a time than the naive belief in the arms race as a way of establishing American supremacy over the Soviet Union. It took several postwar decades for Washington to understand that relations with Moscow can be based only on equal security and strategic parity. And if now it wants to forget this most important lesson of the postwar period, we are in for wasted and even dangerous years from the point of view of international developments. It would be better not to waste time and listen to people who haven't forgotten the lessons of the past.

The former United States ambassador to the Soviet Union, Malcolm Toon, is one such person. He found the moment appropriate for reminding the public of some basic truths about Soviet-American relations. In the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR he writes that the United States cannot reach military supremacy over the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union will not have it. Malcolm Toon comes to the conclusion that the United States can negotiate with the Russians only on equal terms. Malcolm Toon called his opinion unobtrusive advice to Ronald Reagan from a practical diplomat. Whether it's unobtrusive or not, it still is a timely and necessary piece of advice, bringing back to earth those who are daydreaming about American supremacy.

REAGAN'S PLANS FOR MILITARY SPENDING OUTLINED

LD301647 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Dec 80 p 9

[Correspondent Anatoliy Manako dispatch "The Changing of the Guard"]

[Text] New York--In response to a request for his impressions of the composition of the new U.S. administration, the vice president of a well-respected U.S. corporation who recently invited me to his office observed without a trace of diplomatic double-talk:

"I don't know how experienced or wise they are as politicians, but I am sure that they are the people whom big business needs now as never before. They are not ideologists but managers who know their business. In this sense the new administration suits me fine; it has been chosen so well that it can count on the business world's support...."

I felt a strong desire to interrupt him and point out, by way of amplification, that it is unlikely that any of them would be in the Republican administration were it not for that support. It is, after all, no coincidence that six of the eight new cabinet-level appointees have joined the administration straight from the business world. There is no doubt as to whose interests they will protect. If there are doubts, they are of quite a different kind.

But let us leave aside the question of whether or not the new administration is capable of really getting to grips with the problems of the economy and of domestic policy. In the final analysis that is for Americans to judge. The new administration's approach to international problems, which are particularly complex and pressing, is, on the other hand, a matter of perfectly legitimate interest. When asked what might be expected of the new administration in this sphere even seasoned political observers now throw up their hands in perplexity, saying: "How should we know? You had better ask Reagan or, if that is not possible, ask his advisers."

Apropos of this, why not follow this timely recommendation? No sooner had the presidential elections finished than reports appeared in the U.S. press about a so-called "military independence program" prepared with the assistance of a number of the new president's advisers and now being actively discussed on Capitol Hill. Congressmen in close contact with the White House "transition team" claim that the Republican cabinet will use this program as its base. The program's main thrust is to considerably increase the military budget--by $226 billion over the next 5 years. Three-fourths of that colossal sum is earmarked for the production of arms, including nuclear arms. A more detailed breakdown of this 5-year plan looks something like this:

A total of $17 billion on building the B-1 strategic bomber, $6 billion on "refurbishing" the antibomber [antibom-ardirovochnyy] defense system, $15 billion on an antimissile system and $8 million on the production of antimissile satellites with laster weapons.

A further $6 billion on building medium-range missiles, and $2 billion to make the 100 Minuteman 3 ICBM's in the present arsenal mobile before the commissioning of the MX missile system, scheduled for 1976.

By setting such far-reaching goals the authors of this "5-year plan" have even accused the outgoing administration of hesitating too often over the cost and complexity of new types of arms and their incompatibility with the arms control process.

It is difficult as yet to predict how and how far the new U.S. administration is going to implement this draft "5-year" plan for the arms race.

ARKHIPOV RECEIVES MPR'S MAYDAR, TALKS HELD

LD301607 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 80 p 4

[Text] TASS--On 22 December I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received and conversed with D. Maydar, first deputy chairman of the Mongolian People's Republic Council of Ministers.

JAPANESE-USSR RELATIONS EXAMINED ON HOKKAIDO

LD301631 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 80 p 6

[Dispatch from PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Vdovin: "The Warmth of Hokkaido and the Cold Winds of Tokyo"]

[Text] Hokkaido-Tokyo, December--It is hard for a foreigner, especially a European, to go unnoticed in Japan. He is given away by his appearance, speech and bearing in a stream of pedestrians or among those taking a subway or bus ride, doing their shopping or eating out. Wherever he goes a "gaydzin", as foreigners are called here, feels himself to be an object of attention. Most often this is mere curiosity: "What are they like, these people who do a lot of things completely differently from us?", while sometimes it is a desire to help someone who finds himself in Japan.

Most Japanese are convinced that every foreigner they see in their country is a U.S. citizen. But this is understandable, since aside from the 45,000 servicemen stationed at almost 120 Pentagon bases scattered throughout Japan, and their families, the most frequent visitors to the Japanese Islands are U.S. politicians, the military, businessmen, tourists, scientists and academics, artists and so on. The Japanese-U.S. "security treaty" and a multitude of other agreements in the most diverse spheres have tied Tokyo and Washington closely together in the sphere of military cooperation, as well as diplomatically, economically and culturally. It is therefore not surprising that whether in a cafe, on a train or in the street a new acquaintanceship usually begins with the question: "Are you an American?" If the answer is no, the questioner usually starts to enumerate the European countries. Sometimes, so as not to tire him, I immediately give him a clue: "I am from a neighboring country much nearer to you." As a rule this is sufficient for him to say the USSR. But you also get some odd answers. I can remember when, in response to this clue, an Osaka businessman sitting next to me on the Hikari express answered with the question: "So, you are from South Korea?!" On hearing that I was a Soviet citizen, and realizing that he had goofed, he burst out laughing.

Conversations develop in different ways after an acquaintance has been struck up. A worker or cab driver will question you about working conditions in the USSR and how Soviet people live. Young people will ask about how our youngsters get to know one another, how they spend their spare time and how much they pay for their education. Businessmen will immediately start talking about business and economic ties between our countries, their mutual advantageousness and development prospects. In the many years I have worked in Japan I have also come across people who, on learning that I am a Soviet journalist, have terminated the conversation or else tried to turn it against the Soviet Union.

The number of such people has increased recently. The impact of bourgeois propaganda campaign, skillfully orchestrated by certain bourgeois circles, which has splashed all over the pages of newspapers and magazines, movie and television screens and bookstore counters a torrent of fairytales and fantasies about the USSR, Soviet people's way of life, the Soviet Union's foreign and domestic policies and its relations with other countries is making itself felt. With the official authorities' support and assistance, and using both their own and transoceanic and Beijing-originated material, the Japanese media have been pulling out all the stops in their efforts to vilify the Soviet Union.

The myth about the "Soviet threat" and the "buildup of Soviet military preparations in the Far East" has been given a lot of mileage in recent months, and with ever-increasing insistence it is being argued that the situation can only be remedied by ensuring the satisfaction of territorial claims against the USSR and by building up its own military might. Attempts are being made to make the Island of Hokkaido, in whose immediate proximity the Soviet-Japanese border runs, the mainstay of this campaign.

The massive propaganda effort has yielded some fruit. Repeated over and over again, the lies are not only fueling the anti-Sovietism of those who have always been hostile to the USSR but are also sowing doubts in the hearts and minds of people who at one time tried to remain aloof from attacks against the Soviet Union and even numbered themselves among our country's friends. The press and the authorities are already unleashing a new twist in the anti-Soviet campaign by making out that the USSR not only "refuses to meet Japan's lawful demands" but is also using the southern islands in the Kuril chain to "prepare for an intervention on Hokkaido." "Reliable reports," are already appearing which state that, fearing "Soviet aggression," some of the islanders are thinking of moving to other parts of the country, that local companies have begun transferring assets to Tokyo, Osaka and Kitakyushu banks and that calls to increase the military potential on Hokkaido are constantly increasing. The aim of these "reliable reports" is clear: to create unrest among the inhabitants of not only the northern part of Japan but also of the country's other islands in order to justify building up military efforts on a national scale, strengthening the military alliance with the United States and extending its sphere of operation to regions far beyond Japan's borders.

"Do they really fear a 'Soviet threat' on Hokkaido and do they believe such fabrications?" I asked a Tokyo journalist acquaintance. "Of course not," he smiled. "All these reports are considerably exaggeraged, although under the influence of the press and official statements anti-Soviet prejudices have recently been having an increasing impact among a certain section of the island's population. But why don't you go there and discuss it with the local inhabitants?"

...After a 2-hour flight the domestic airline jet came in to land at Kushiro--not only Hokkaido's but Japan's largest fishing center.

This city of fishermen, paper industry workers, miners and sailors welcomed us with warmth and sunshine. "The temperature in Kushiro is 10 degrees above zero," the stewardess announced. "Such warm weather at this time of year is a great rarity for eastern Hokkaido," we were told by the local activists of the friendship with the USSR movement who welcomed our party of Soviet journalists. "Even nature is pleased at the arrival of friends."

Reminiscent of our Primorskiy Kray, the landscape was a joy to behold and heartwarming, but in the unseasonably warm weather you were almost physically aware of the invisible political cold winds blowing not from the north but from the south--from the Japanese capital. During our stay on Hokkaido we learned that representatives of the Soviet Embassy and of the Consulate General in Sapporo were refused permission to travel to Kushiro to take part in a ceremonial soiree marking the 63d anniversary of Great October, held on the premises of the Japanese-Soviet society for friendship and trade on eastern Hokkaido. Red, blue and green billboards and white and blue obelisks bearing slogans like "Let Us Further Develop the Movement for the Return of the Northern Territories" are springing up with increasing frequency in many of the island's cities and along its roads.

In the few days we spent on eastern Hokkaido we drove hundreds of kilometers, visiting Nemuro and Cape Nosappu, where the borders of our two countries are closest to one another, and met with representatives of the most diverse sections of the population--from the local authorities to ordinary fishermen and workers. Among them were people who struck up conversations about "the northern territories" and thought up "conditions" or simply demanded their "return." But the overwhelming majority of those we spoke to did not raise this topic and spoke instead of the need to strengthen friendship, good-neighborliness, mutual understanding and cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Speaking about the city's development plans the mayor of Kushiro, (T. Vanibuti), recalled with pleasure trips he had made to Sakhalin and his city's fraternal ties with Kholmsk. "Strengthening friendship between our countries," he said, "will be of great significance for the whole of Hokkaido's population." The leaders of the association of fishing cooperatives who run the sea kale industry near the borders of the USSR laughed when I asked them about the "Soviet threat." "You'd better ask about that in Tokyo where this invention originates," they said. "Friendship and cooperation with the USSR is our foremost concern." "Some years ago our company, which has maintained business ties with your country for many decades now, supplied the USSR with the same equipment you saw in our workshops. We would like cooperation between Japan and the USSR to develop," we were told by (S. Ikeda), director of the (Nitiro Gyegye) company's fish cannery.

We were told the same thing by representatives of a trawler cooperative in Kushiro who presented each of us with a copy of a Japanese-Russian fisherman's phrasebook which they had just published and which, in addition to specialist terms and specimen documents, includes the bilingual texts of Russian songs popular in our country and in Japan. The proprietress of the "Rubashka" restaurant invited us to sample Russian dishes which she had learned how to prepare from cooks on Soviet ships calling at the island's ports. Trade unionists told us how in May this year they organized a demonstration in Kushiro protesting the large-scale maneuvers to repel "an attack from the north" staged by the Japanese Armed Forces.

Such utterances and sentiments--this is confirmed by the newspaper AKAHATA--are characteristic of the inhabitants not only of eastern Hokkaido but also of other regions of the island which are destined to become the "first victim of the USSR's invasion of Hokkaido." "Talk about a 'Soviet threat' is an attempt to delude, to deceive people who do not know the true state of affairs," said (T. Khamori), mayor of Wakkanai City, from where Sakhalin can be seen in clear weather. "Our city's future lies in friendship with our neighbors, the nearest of which is the Soviet Union." His fellow countryman, T. Takahasi, director of the local motor vessel cooperative, and S. Takagi, chairman of the Nemuro city marine resources society [obshchestvo morskogo promysla], whom the authorities try to uphold as an example of the "movement for the return of the northern territories," hold the same opinion. As AKAHATA points out, it is interesting to note that the majority of these people belongs to conservative circles.

Sentiments so undesirable for the authorities--in a place on which they were counting for unconditional and full support for the anti-Soviet campaign--are troubling official Tokyo, and its envoys are again traveling to Hokkaido to try to find new means and methods of inciting unease, watchfulness and hostility in the island's population with regard to the Soviet Union. But, as the press observes and as many of our interlocutors have said, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the authorities to gain their own ends.

It would of course be incorrect to think that only friends of the Soviet Union live on Hokkaido. However, my trip, meetings and talks with its inhabitants have convinced me that the majority of the island's million population does not wish to be in the ranks of our country's opponents.

"Moreover," Mr Muto, chairman of the Japanese-Soviet society for friendship and trade on eastern Hokkaido, said in conversation with me, "the attempts by certain circles to inflame and galvanize anti-Soviet sentiments on the island have had the opposite effect. The movement for opening houses of friendship with the USSR in the various cities of our territory has been gaining momentum in recent years. The first of them flung open its doors at the beginning of the 1970's in the settlement of Sarufutsu on the northwest coast, where first a monument to the Soviet sailors shipwrecked here was erected and then a house of friendship was opened. Sapporo joined in the process in 1976. The house of friendship in Kushiro too received its first guests then, and the one in Wakkanai in June of this year. Preparations for the building of houses of friendship in Hakodate and Otaru are now in progress. The movement is also winning adherents in other cities of the country; these are sending their envoys to us in order to pick up experience. There are plans to build houses of friendship in Niigata, Osaka, Tokyo and other cities.

"The more there are of such beacons of Japanese-Soviet friendship," says Muto, "the better we shall know and understand one another and cooperate with each other. Therefore, as long as I live, I shall devote all my strength to this movement, since the struggle for friendship with the Soviet Union is the struggle for peace, for the future of Japan."

BRIEFS

TRADE UNION MEETING--The 15th exchange meeting of Soviet and Japanese trade unions ended today in Moscow. In a protocol adopted at the meeting, the two sides expressed satisfaction at the cooperation by the Soviet and Japanese trade unions in 1980 and confirmed their resolve to continue and expand this cooperative relationship for friendship and good neighborliness between the Soviet Union and Japan, as well as for the peace and security of the Far East, Asia and the rest of the world. [Text] [Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1400 GMT 23 Dec 80 OW]

AMERICAN 'MILITARY' ADVISER KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN

LD302034 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 30 Dec 80

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Oleg Blinov and Yevgeniy Osipovskiy]

[Text] The Indian information agency has reported from Kabul that in the Afghan Province of Zabol during the elimination of a band of mercenaries an American military adviser was killed. He was working in a band of terrorists in the south of Afghanistan. The presence of American instructors in counterrevolutionary bands on the territory of Afghanistan testifies to the spreading U.S. interference in the affairs of this country. A witness to the activization of American interference in Afghan affairs was the correspondent of the newspaper Philadelphia INQUIRER. He was at the base of Afghan counterrevolutionaries on Pakistani territory. In the words of the American correspondent, a secret program of arms supplies and instruction of counterrevolutionary formations is being conducted by the CIA of the United States. In this unseemly affair the CIA is actively helping representatives of the special services of China, Pakistan and Egypt.

The interference of the reactionary forces in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is arousing sharp indignation in world public opinion. AAPSO has stated its support for the struggle of the Afghan people against feudalism and reaction, for consolidation of the gains of the April revolution. The permanent secretary of this international organization called for strengthening international solidarity with the Afghan people.

JAPANESE SOCIALIST YOUTH GROUP VISITS DRA

LD302114 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] Moscow, 30 Dec, TASS--An overwhelming majority of the Afghan people supports the progressive transformations, which are being carried out by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. A statement to this effect was made at a press conference here today by members of the delegation of the Japan League of Socialist Youth, who were on a visit in Afghanistan from December 19 to 29 at the invitation of the Democratic Youth of Afghanistan Organization. Ex-chairman of the Central Committee of the Japan League of Socialist Youth Koichiro Yamazaki and member of the organization's Central Standing Committee Masao Hosoi visited the cities of Kabul and Jalalabad, met with representatives of various sections of the country's population, students, workers, peasants, and clergymen.

"In the course of these meetings", said Koichiro Yamazaki, "we could convince ourselve that the Government and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, which rely themselves on active support of the working people, are consistently implementing large-scale transformations covering all aspects of the country's economic, social and cultural life."

"We could see with our own eyes," Yamazaki went on to say, "that even in the areas bordering on Pakistan, where the enemies of the revolution are most active, life has returned to normal and creative work is being carried out on a large scale, into which an overwhelming majority of the Afghans are drawn. A vast role in this work is played by the country's progressive youth, who are on the forward lines of building a new society--in developing industry and carrying out the agrarian reform, in the efforts to eliminate illiteracy and emancipate the women, in the defence of the gains of the revolution from the outside aggression.

We would like to note the patience and persistence, with which the transformations are carried out in Afghanistan, where feudal and other survivals [as received] in the winds of many people are still strong. The Afghans, with whom he met, Yamazaki said, had always pointed out the great assistance rendered to their country by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community.

"The tour of Afghanistan," he pointed out, "has shown us that counter-revolutionary forces, which are supported from abroad, have no firm base in that country. They would be unable to perpetrate their bloody crimes on the Afghan soil had it not been for the backing by the United States, China and Pakistan and some other reactionary regimes in the region. When in Kabul we saw specimens of U.S., Chinese and Egyptian weapons, which were captured from the bandits sent from abroad. This is direct evidence of the crude interference in the affairs of the Afghan people, which has been carried out for a number of years by international imperialism and its accomplices."

"We could convince ourselves of the dirty methods used by the bourgeois propaganda in setting afloat all sorts of inventions about that country," Koichiro Yamazaki pointed out. I will cite only one example. On December 26 BBC reported for the whole world to hear that a member of our delegation had been allegedly killed in Jalalabad in a clash with counter-revolutionaries. As you see," Yamasaki said, "we are safe and sound and say that we have never seen any 'fighters for Islam', who had allegedly attacked us in that city."

"The lies and slanders," Yamazaki said in conclusion, "cannot conceal from world public the real state of things in Afghanistan, which is advancing on the difficult road of progressive transformations. On returning to Japan we will make every effort to expose the fairy-tales of the bourgeois propaganda, to tell the Japanese the truth about Afghanistan."

FURTHER ON NATIONAL PATRIOTIC FORCES CONFERENCE

LD301350 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] Kabul, 30 Dec, TASS--The results of the conference of the national-patriotic forces of the DRA which took place in the Afghan capital recently and in which about 2,000 delegates of all the sections of Afghan society participated, are being widely commented here. Represented at the conference were workers and peasants who are members of the trade unions and peasant cooperative. Widely represented at the conference were Afghan tribes--by over 600 people. Creative unions, societies for friendship, peace and solidarity, and the clergy--both Sunnites and Shi'ites, national bourgeoisie, tradesmen and entrepreneurs sent their representatives to the conference. It was attended by representatives of almost all the provinces of the country--national minorities, nomads, many members of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), ministers, and members of the Revolutionary Council of the DRA.

Among the delegates were about 80 prominent socio-political figures of the former regimes--former Prime Minister 'Abdul Zahir, former Member of Parliament Hadji Murat, clergyman Haqqani, writer Mohammad Hiy-aq and others. The forum gathered on a memorable date--the first anniversary of the beginning of the new stage of the revolution which paved the way for the country's political and economic progress. An opening speech was delivered by Saleh Mohammad Ziray, secretary of the PDPA Central Committee.

Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, chairman of the Revolutionary Council and the prime minister of the DRA, made a report. He emphasized that the April revolution created real opportunities in the country for the unification of all the sections of Afghanistan's people with a view to successfully realizing the tasks set in the struggle against the counter-revolutionaries, in the name of raising the material and cultural standards of living of the long-suffering and proud people of Afghanistan.

Babrak Karmal substantiated a possibility and necessity of the establishment of a national fatherland front--a mass organization representing all classes of social, national and tribal origin--for solving the tasks of the revolution successfully.

The workers' and peasants' alliance which will unite all the other national-patriotic forces--clergy, tribes, national enterpreneurs and other sectors of Afghan society--will constitute the political foundation of a national fatherland front, Babrak Karmal said.

We announced the government's decision to raise the wages of the workers of the state-run enterprises by 26.6 percent on an average in the new year, and stated the government's determination to carry out a just agrarian reform.

Touching upon foreign-policy problems, the Afghan leader again offered to the governments of Pakistan and Iran to settle Afghan-Pakistani and Afghan-Iranian relations by political negotiations.

Babrak Karmal's report gives a high appraisal of the results of the talks in Moscow with the Soviet leaders and of the USSR's all-round fraternal assistance to Afghanistan.

Babrak Karmal pointed out an exceptional importance of the Soviet initiative on strengthening peace in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. The initiative was advanced by Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidum of the USSR Supreme Soviet, during his recent visit to India.

Speaking in deliberations at the conference were representatives of various organizations, of workers, peasants, tribes, national enterpreneurs and delegates from the provinces. They all declared in support of the policy of the party and the Government of the DRA and ardently supported the idea of establishing a national fatherland front.

The conference elected a supreme organizational committee to prepare and hold a congress of the National Fatherland Front.

TALKS ON POLISH-USSR ECONOMIC COOPERATION HELD

LD301926 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1700 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] A conversation was held today at the USSR Gosplan between Nikolay Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan, and Mieczyslaw Jagielski, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers.

Questions of further development of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Poland and the state of work connected with the completion of the coordination of state plans of the Soviet Union and Poland for 1981-85 were discussed.

On the Soviet side the talks were attended by Leonid Kostandov and Nikolay Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and on the Polish side by Henryk Kisiel, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, chairman of the Planning Commission of the Council of Ministers, and Kazimierz Olszewski, the Polish ambassador to the Soviet Union.

POLISH PAPER CITED ON RELATIONS WITH USSR

LD301236 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] The Polish paper DZIENNIK LUDOWY notes that an atmosphere of fraternity and mutual understanding characterizes not only Soviet-Polish relations, but also relations between all countries of the socialist community. This was vividly demonstrated during the Moscow meeting of leading figures of states participating in the Warsaw Pact and also during the visit by Czyrek, Polish minister of foreign affairs, to Moscow.

ZAGLADIN COMMENTS ON POLAND TO PAESE SERA

AU221601 Rome ANSA in English 1530 GMT 22 Dec 80

[Text] Rome, 22 Dec (ANSA)--Soviet Communist Party Foreign Affairs Chief Vadim Zagladin denied that the Solidarity free trade union in Poland deviated from the socialist system in an interview appearing in the Italian PAESE SERA today.

"We all hope that the Polish comrades will be able to solve their problems in peace and tranquillity," Zagladin told the pro-communist Rome daily.

Solidarity stemmed from a series of specific conditions in Poland, the deputy chairman of the Soviet party's Central Committee International Commission explained.

"Firstly," he said, "the old leadership of the Polish Communist Party did not live up to the promises it made at its congresses."

"The Gdansk strikes demanded that those pledges be fulfilled," Zagladin went on, "and there is nothing contradictory with the essence of the socialist system in that."

"Secondly," he added, "the unions worked hard, but did not fulfill their task....They did not even acquire the rights that unions in other socialist countries have, like legislative initiative for example."

The creation of the Solidarity labor movement, Zagladin reasoned, "did not therefore represent a split."

The Soviet party official was interviewed by a PAESE SERA correspondent in Paris where, in the words of the Rome daily, "The Russian communist roving ambassador for Europe and communist parties was visiting as part of a delegation from the Supreme Soviet.

Zagladin had this to say about the recent rumors of Warsaw Pact troop movements in Poland: "Let's stick to the facts. The facts show that American observation planes move around the Polish border, that the American fleet is near the Polish sea, that NATO holds talks about Poland.

"In 1968, a tough year for France, what would have been said if the Soviet Union sent its fleet toward French ports and the Warsaw Pact held a meeting to discuss the May 1968 student unrest."

When pressed by the interviewer for a clear answer to the question about whether or not there were troop movements in Poland, Zagladin replied: "Poland is a member of the Warsaw Pact, not NATO. "There were combined Soviet and Polish maneuvers a month and a half ago, a perfectly normal thing."

GROMYKO RECEIVES OUTGOING GDR AMBASSADOR OTT

LD301644 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Ott, ambassador of the German Democratic Republic to the USSR, in connection with his forthcoming departure for home, and had a conversation with him which was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Comrade Gromyko heartily congratulated the ambassador on the award to him of the Order of Friendship of Peoples for his active work in consolidating friendship and the development of all-round cooperation between the USSR and the GDR. Comrade Gromyko also gave a luncheon in Ott's honor today.

KNOPP-LED MSZMP DELEGATION VISITS USSR 14-20 DEC

LD241645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 80 p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of MSZMP workers headed by A. Knopp, deputy chief of the MSZMP Central Committee Department of Science, Culture and Education, visited the Soviet Union from 14 to 20 December in accordance with the plan for CPSU and MSZMP interparty links.

The Hungarian comrades familiarized themselves with work experience with respect to party and state leadership of scientific research activity and higher education. They had meetings and talks in the CPSU Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Department, at the Kharkovskiy Ukrainian CP Obkom, at the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers Higher Certification Commission and visited a number of VUZes and scientific institutes.

COMMUNIQUE ON FRYDENLUND TALKS WITH OFFICIALS

LD301655 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 80 Morning Edition p 4

[Text of "Soviet-Norwegian Communique"]

[Text] Norwegian Foreign Minister K. Frydenlund was in the USSR on an official visit from 19 through 23 December 1980 at the Soviet Government's invitation. The minister visited Leningrad and Moscow.

N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received K. Frydenlund and had a talk with him. The minister conveyed to N.A. Tikhonov an invitation from Norwegian Prime Minister O. Nordli to pay an official visit to Norway.

Talks were held between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and K. Frydenlund.

Negotiations and talks took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere. The sides stressed the significance of the continuation of regular consultations between the two countries on a wide range of international problems and on issues of Norwegian relations. In this connection the Norwegian side is inviting a Soviet delegation to Oslo for the next round of talks on the demarcation of the Continental Shelf in the Barents Sea in the very near future.

Both sides voiced the determination to build relations between the two countries on the basis of good neighborliness and businesslike cooperation in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act and of the Soviet-Norwegian agreements in various spheres.

The ministers believe it is important to further develop trade, economic, technical and scientific ties between the two countries and to strengthen exchanges in the sphere of culture and art.

The sides were united in the opinion that the relaxation of tension is essential, possible and useful and voiced their determination to promote by every means its transformation into the leading trend in international relations. There is no sensible alternative to peaceful and equitable cooperation between states.

The Soviet side took into consideration the Norwegian side's statements regarding the unchanged nature of Norway's policy with respect to not placing foreign bases and nuclear weapons on Norwegian territory.

During the talks emphasis was placed on the significance of the consistent and persistent continuation of detente in Europe in accordance with the principles and goals reflected in Europe in accordance with the principles and goals reflected in the Helsinki Final Act. The sides expressed themselves in favor of the need to perform the work of the Madrid meeting of representatives of the countries which took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in a constructive spirit and to achieve at the meeting balanced progress for all sections of the Final Act.

The sides exchanged opinions on problems concerning the expansion of measures to strengthen security in Europe. They agree that at the Madrid meeting this question should be examined with the view of deciding to convene a conference which, through expanding confidence-building measures, would help to create conditions for the subsequent transition to practical steps in the sphere of limiting and reducing arms.

The ministers expressed satisfaction at the start of the talks between the USSR and U.S. representatives on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe. They also voiced the hope that the speediest progress would be achieved at the talks in Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe.

In the sides' opinion, other opportunities should also be used to achieve real progress in efforts on arms limitation and disarmament. The significance of the positive holding of a special UN General Assembly session on disarmament in 1982 was emphasized in this connection.

The sides discussed the situation in various parts of the world and stressed the importance of safeguarding lasting peace and international security and settling any conflict situations by political means. The USSR and Norway are convinced that there are no problems which could not be resolved by political means, through negotiations.

The two sides noted that on some questions there are differences in the positions of the USSR and Norway. Readiness was expressed to continue the exchange of opinions on these questions at the appropriate levels.

The ministers expressed satisfaction at the talks which had been held and stressed the usefulness of the exchange of opinions and information. They also expressed mutual interest in strengthening and developing contacts and cooperation between Norway and the Soviet Union.

Norwegian Foreign Minister K. Frydenlund confirmed the invitation to A.A. Gromyko to pay an official visit to Norway.

TURKISH OFFICIAL CITED ON TIES, COOPERATION

LD291439 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Dec 80 p 1

[Correspondent A. Filippov dispatch: "Relations of Good Neighborliness"]

[Text] Ankara, 21 Dec--S. Kocatopcu, minister of industry and technology, has expressed himself in favor of the further development of relations of good neighborliness and business cooperation between the USSR and Turkey. The Iskenderun metallurgical combine, the Seydisehir aluminum enterprise, the petroleum refinery near Izmir and other major industrial establishments erected with the USSR's technical and economic assistance, he told newsmen, are a graphic testimony of fruitful cooperation.

It has been demonstrated convincingly to the whole world, the minister stressed, that, given the mutual desire, two neighboring states can develop good neighborliness and cooperation despite differences in their sociopolitical systems.

BRIEFS

RESETTLERS IN FRG--Moscow, 30 Dec (DPA)--In 1980, 6,653 ethnic German resettlers came to the Federal Republic from the Soviet Union. This is the lowest number for 5 years. Last year the figure was 6,947. [Hamburg DPA in German 1436 GMT 30 Dec 80 LD]

NABAVI DISCUSSES RUMORS OF THREATS, U.S. REPLY

LD301422 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] Tehran, 30 Dec, TASS--There is information that the USA may soon launch a fresh armed provocative action in the Persian Gulf area, a press conference was told here by the official representative of the Iranian Government, Minister of State for Administrative Affairs B. Nabavi.

He stressed that the USA is looking for a pretext for fresh provocations and conspiracies against the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is not fortuitous that accomplices of U.S. imperialism, who are building up internal tension, have stepped up their activities in the country, the minister pointed out. The minister also pointed out that if the USA does not meet the demands of the Iranian Majlis, the American hostages will remain in Iran.

Commenting on the reply of the U.S. side on the hostage problem, Nabavi said: We cannot accept as a guarantee 50-60 pages of paper signed by Carter or Reagan and release the hostages for it. We will by no means take America's word for it. Experience has shown that the USA cannot be trusted, and therefore we demand weightier guarantees.

Further Details

LD311040 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 31 Dec 80

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Viktor Levin]

[Text] Iranian Minister Nabavi, who is participating in the talks concerning the U.S. hostages, has spoken at a press conference in Tehran. As a BBC correspondent reports, Nabavi said in particular that Iran is prepared to study possible proposals by the United States concerning guarantees which Washington may give the Iranian side.

As is known, Iran is demanding $24 billion in financial guarantees to safeguard its claims against the United States. If this payment is made, then the hostages will be free. The United States has rejected Iran's proposal. As one can judge from the BBC correspondent's report, Tehran is ready to hear the U.S. side's proposals.

The dispatch also says that Minister Nabavi was asked what could be said about the statement by President-elect Reagan that the Iranian authorities are behaving like barbarians. Nabavi answered: We do not take Mr Reagan's statement seriously; he spoke like the heroes in the westerns in which he was featured.

RPP CITES ARAB SUPPORT FOR BREZHNEV INITIATIVE

LD301506 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 24 Dec 80

[Text] The proposals put forward by Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev during his recent visit to India for ensuring peace and security in the Gulf are receiving growing support in the Arab world. The national movements in Bahrain, Oman and Saudi Arabia have expressed support for the Soviet initiative. In a joint statement they said that the positive initiative, which is of the utmost importance, is totally consistent with the interests of the peoples of the region and their aspirations, and serves the cause of world peace. In taking this step, the statement adds, the Soviet Union has confirmed its commitment to its peaceful foreign policy and shown how false are the allegations of the United States and its allies and Arab reactionaries, who assert that peace and security in the Gulf are endangered by the Soviet Union.

The threat to the safety of the region does indeed exist, but its source is not the Soviet Union; it comes from the United States of America, which tries to heighten tension in the region by building military bases and forming aggressive blocks and which has amassed huge naval and air forces on the pretext of protecting the oilfields and ensuring oil supplies to the West.

Recently it has been noted that the United States of America has been trying to exploit the Iranian-Iraqi military conflict for its own imperialist ends. Attention should be given in this conjunction to the growing military cooperation between Washington and Riyadh, cooperation which gives the impression that the United States wants Saudi Arabia to become the main base of its policy in the region by frightening it with the danger to its oilfields as a result of continued Iranian-Iraqi hostilities. Riyadh which has hitherto shown much caution toward direct military cooperation with Washington has, it appears, succumbed to American pressure and agreed to buy a number of American aircraft equipped with AWACS. It also agreed to have a group of American experts to use these aircraft.

Although Saudi Deputy Prime Minister Prince Fahd some days ago stressed that Riyadh would not agree to the construction of foreign military bases on its territory and has no intention of giving military facilities to any state, the fact remains that the American military presence in Saudi Arabia is continually increasing. The WALL STREET JOURNAL said that now that the Saudis have agreed to the stationing of an American detachment on their territory, they will find it difficult to remain distant from the policy of the United States militarily and diplomatically, especially since the United States will most likely intensify its pressure on them to make them amenable to open military cooperation.

U.S. strategic ambitions in the Gulf are no secret to anyone. The United States wants to establish direct military domination over it and to assert military superiority there to ensure its own ends. That is why it rejects the Soviet proposals which are welcomed by all honest national forces in the Gulf as a practical course toward peace and stability in the region.

TISHRIN CITED ON MURDER OF SYRIAN OFFICIAL

LD281417 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 28 Dec 80

[Text] Damascus, 28 Dec, TASS--The reactionary Moslem Brothers Organization has perpetrated a fresh criminal act. The bandits killed last night noted Syrian public and political figure Dariush al-Zuni, member of the Central leadership of the National Progressive Front, member of the Politbureau of the Unionist Socialist Party, the newspaper TISHRIN reported.

D. al-Zuni was also member of the World Peace Council, a noted lawyer and author of a number of research papers and articles on law. He condemned in the press the subversive activity of the Moslem Brothers. In connection with the crime of the reactionaries the newspaper TISHRIN writes: "Our people will not spare the murderers backed by Tel Aviv. The hand of justice will reach them in whatever holes they may hide."

CHERNENKO ADDRESSES FRIENDSHIP RALLY, MEETS CASTRO

Rally Speech

LD300853 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 80 p 4

[Unnamed TASS special correspondent dispatch: "Soviet-Cuban Friendship Meeting"]

[Text] Havana, 20 Dec--The Jose Marti Metallurgical plant is rightly regarded as one of the leading enterprises in Cuba's base industry. It can with complete justification be called a beacon of Soviet-Cuban friendship. In November of this year the plant collective celebrated the 20th anniversary of fruitful cooperation between Cuba and the USSR in the sphere of metallurgy. In the last few years, with the Soviet Union's assistance, a great deal of work has been done there to modernize production and replace obsolete equipment, and this has made it possible to almost quadruple the volume of output compared with 1959. Today modernization making provision for a further considerable expansion of production is in full swing at the plant, with Soviet assistance.

The enterprise collective greeted the CPSU delegation taking part in the Second Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Congress, which is headed by K.U. Chernenko, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, warmly and fraternally, as their closest friends. The Soviet guests visited the Soviet-produced "250" mill, commissioned in 1976, and talked with the workers.

A ceremonial Soviet-Cuban friendship meeting was held on the plant's grounds and took the form of a vivid demonstration of the firm ties of fraternity linking the two countries' peoples.

The Cuban people are proud of their friendship with Lenin's great motherland, (A. Fumero), secretary of the plant party committee, stated in his speech at the meeting. The Soviet Union is helping us to develop a multisectorial national economy and to train our own cadres of specialists. It is particularly pleasant for us, he said, turning to the CPSU delegation, that you are visiting our plant during the work of the Second PCC Congress. The Jose Marti plant collective has greeted the congress with new labor victories.

We know that 19 December is the birthday of L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, (A. Fumero) went on to stress. On behalf of the Cuban metallurgical workers we ask you to convey to him our cordial greetings and best wishes in his multifaceted activity as head of the CPSU and the Soviet state. All our people are aware of the tremendous work Comrade L.I. Brezhnev carries out in the cause of building communism in your country and the tremendous contribution he makes to the tireless struggle for peace throughout the world and strengthened solidarity among the peoples.

The meeting was addressed by K.U. Chernenko, who was warmly greeted by those present.

After thanking them for the warm, sincere reception he said:

It makes us feel very good to meet with you, the glorious collective of Cuban metallurgical workers. How can one not rejoice when one constantly sees for oneself here on Cuban soil that Soviet-Cuban friendship is firm and inviolable.

The many million-strong Soviet people send their wholehearted fraternal greetings to you, the Cuban workers, and to all the working people--builders of a socialist Cuba.

It is especially pleasant for us to carry out the instructions of Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and to convey to you and the whole Cuban people his wishes for success in your work and happiness in your lives.

The words Leonid Ilich addressed to the First PCC Congress--"There is a bit of Cuba in the heart of every Soviet person"--are a simple and clear expression of Soviet people's attitude toward the Cuban revolution, your creative work and your struggle.

Your country is now living under the sign of a most important event in its life--the Second Communist Party Congress. The congress proceedings, the Central Committee report delivered by Comrade Fidel Castro and the debate that has begun are making a great impression. They are a great, meaningful discussion among people who know what should be done and how, people for whom the working people's interests are supreme. Hence the sober assessments and self-critical approach, combined with an unshakable belief that free labor can achieve anything.

In the 5 years since the First PCC Congress the creative, constructive nature of the Cuban revolution has been still more fully revealed.

The country's economic potential has been augmented by the birth of the cane-harvesting combine plant in the city of Holguin, the textile combine in Santa Clara and the mineral fertilizer plant in Nuevitas, by the modernization of sugar enterprises and nickel combines and by the creation of new power stations. And great numbers of schools, hospitals and cultural and sports centers have been constructed! We share your pride at what has been achieved over these years of persistent labor.

At the same time you rightly believe that it is necessary to continue to seek to exploit all production reserves and potential and to master socialist methods of economic activity. These tasks, as the saying goes, confront you in all their magnitude.

We know from our own experience that this is necessary. Labor productivity, Vladimir Ilich Lenin repeatedly said, is in the last analysis the most important thing, the main thing for the victory of the new social system. Increased labor productivity is the source for strengthening society's economic might and continuously boosting working people's material well-being.

It is only recently that Cuba entered its third decade since the revolution. Yet how many countries all over the world and, of course, in Latin America admire it and even envy it.

Socialist Cuba is a country of free and equal people, a country that is persistently seeking its own ways of improving the people's well-being, a country that has done an astonishing amount to satisfy working people's spiritual requirements. And all this has been achieved under conditions of unceasing provocations and pressure from American imperialism.

That is the kind of strength the Cuban revolution has; that is what the Cuban people's inflexible revolutionary spirit means!

The makers of the historic changes on Cuban soil are Cuba's working class, peasantry and intelligentsia. The PCC, headed by Comrade Fidel Castro, that outstanding revolutionary, great patriot and internationalist, is leading the Cuban people onward. There can be no doubt that socialist Cuba's future will be marked by many glorious new achievements.

The new 5-year plan, which the congress is now discussing, confronts your collective, like the whole country, with complex and crucial tasks. With all our heart we wish you, dear friends, further successes in work and new labor victories!

Your enterprise works in close businesslike contact with Soviet plants' metallurgical workers. The geographical range of these ties is huge. The Cuban workers and engineers have assimilated experience of smelting metal at the plants of Volgograd, Zaporczhye and Baku. Soviet steelworkers from Magnitogorsk, Elektrostal and Rustavi have often visited you for friendship smeltings.

And these ties are being given increasingly profound and multifaceted expression. Along with the cooperation in production questions, experience of party and social activity is being exchanged. And this enriches us all and makes us stronger.

The communist parties' policy, K.U. Chernenko continued, is a profoundly people's policy. That also applies in full measure to communists' international activity.

You know how many constructive ideas and proposals have been and are being put forward by the Soviet Union, Cuba and the other socialist community countries to ensure a peaceful future for mankind. It is precisely the fraternal socialist countries that were the initiators and inspirers of the policy of the relaxation of international tension. A real possibility of improving the world political climate is embodied in this policy.

But the old world is clinging to what is old. Of late we have come up against dangerous attempts by imperialism and reaction to overturn detente, step up the arms race and bar the way to progressive social changes.

"The question now is this: what will happen next?" Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said during his recent visit to India, "If this negative and, to speak plainly, dangerous line is continued, peace will be seriously jeopardized. But if reason triumphs, a constructive policy that accords with the people's hopes and with all countries' interests will once again forge its way ahead."

While we are aware of the dangers with which imperialist policy is fraught, we are a long way from feeling any kind of pessimism. Our certainty that the future belongs to peaceful relations among peoples and states has firm foundations. For all the zigzags of events and abrupt fluctuations in the political barometer, one cannot help seeing that the world has nonetheless improved.

The past year has been a difficult year for the detente policy. Nonetheless, despite the definite cold snap in the international climate, the trend toward detente has persisted. Moreover, there is now a strengthening awareness in many countries of the importance of preserving and augmenting the fruits of the detente process.

And is it not a fact that the colonial empires have crumbled and the overwhelming majority of Asian, African and Latin American countries have gained their independence? And a fact that the communist and workers movement is growing and strengthening in the capitalist countries? And, of course, a cardinal fact that the socialist community--that great and mighty family of free peoples--is developing and gathering fresh strength?

The recent meeting of the Warsaw Pact states' leaders in Moscow was a vivid new expression of the fraternal countries' will for peace and detente and their unity. The meeting participants expressed the unshakable determination not to allow the development of international relations to be reversed. This meeting shows that the fraternal socialist countries are vigilant. They will permit no one to undermine the peoples' socialist gains. The results of the Moscow meeting are a new call for peace and a serious warning to the fomentors of international conflicts.

The road to peace is a wide road. There is room enough on it for every country and every people.

And we advocate pooling the efforts of all peace-loving states in the name of a tranquil and peaceful future for our world.

Cuba's vigorous foreign policy activity meets with the fullest understanding in the Soviet Union. Cuba's great prestige in the socialist community, the nonaligned movement and the world arena as a whole is the direct consequence of the fact that Cuba struggles consistently against tyranny in international relations, neocolonialism and racism and pursues a noble internationalist policy.

The Soviet Union wishes the eighties and all subsequent decades to be a time of peace. We will travel toward this goal together with Cuba, with all the fraternal socialist countries and with all peace-loving forces of our time.

The head of the CPSU delegation went on to describe our country's life now.

First of all there is, of course, labor, the fulfillment of the extremely large-scale socioeconomic plans, the construction of new industrial and agricultural enterprises, power stations and railroads, new cities and scientific and cultural centers.

More than 600 million tons of oil per year, more than 150 million tons of steel, almost 115 million tons of mineral fertilizers and 130 million tons of cement are a few indicators of Soviet industrial strength. Our country firmly leads the world in terms of all those important economic items.

Broad new horizons of communist building are outlined in the CPSU Central Committee draft for the congress of the "Main Guidelines of the USSR's Economic and Social Development in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990." This draft has been submitted for discussion by the entire party and the entire people. The CPSU Central Committee document is evoking the wholehearted support of Soviet people, communists and nonparty people alike.

In the eighties too the supreme goal of the Communist Party's economic strategy is the steady upsurge of the people's material and cultural level and the creation of better conditions for the all-round development of the individual.

Understandably, it is not easy to implement the great plans, especially as regions with a harsh climate which are a long way from the existing economic centers must be developed in order to augment energy and other resources. There are many difficult tasks. But we have tremendous experience. Soviet people are working with great enthusiasm and are seeking to mark the upcoming 26th party congress by increasing production efficiency and fulfilling the plans ahead of schedule. Socialist competition in honor of the congress has gained all-union scope in our country. Each day brings news of further labor successes: One Soviet republic after another is reporting the fulfillment of the main 5-year-plan targets. In general, the whole country is seeking to work in shock fashion.

Comrades: We share with you common deeds, joys and concerns.

We note with great satisfaction that Soviet-Cuban relations are developing on the firm foundation of the joint declaration signed here in Havana by Comrades Fidel Castro and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. This declaration, permeated by the ideas of internationalism, is a real action program for strengthening and enriching Soviet-Cuban political, economic and ideological cooperation.

We are building Soviet-Cuban friendship together. The thousands and thousands of kilometers separating Cuba and the Soviet Union are no obstacle to it. And is it not significant that our fraternal cooperation has now extended even to space, where valiant sons of our peoples recently carried out good work.

In 10 days a great red letter day will arrive in Cuba. It will also be celebrated by Soviet people and all socialist Cuba's friends.

For 22 years ago, on 1 January 1959, as a result of the victorious revolution the word "Cuba" flew round the world as though on wings. The Cuban revolution is continuing to advance. It is on the offensive. The main front of the offensive, and the PCC congress is stressing this, is now the boosting of the national economy and the growth of the people's prosperity. All Cuba's friends believe that the country will win victories in this salient too.

In conclusion K.U. Chernenko wished all Cuba's citizens the successful accomplishment of the great plans and wished every Cuban family happiness and prosperity. He proposed toasts in honor of the glorious working class of the Republic of Cuba, the PCC and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Fidel Castro and in honor of the inviolable friendship between the Soviet and Cuban peoples.

To tumultuous applause the head of the CPSU delegation presented the Cuban comrades with a picture by the Soviet artist G.M. Manizer depicting Red Square--the heart of the USSR's capital--in commemoration of the meeting.

Meeting With Castro

LD301235 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 80 p 4

[Text] Havana, 22 Dec, TASS--A meeting has taken place here between F. Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee and president of the Cuban councils of state and ministers, and K.U. Chernenko, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU delegation to the Second PCC Congress.

During the conversation deep satisfaction was expressed with the continuous consolidation of the bonds of friendship and fraternity between the communist parties and peoples of the two countries and the successful development of their all-round cooperation in line with the Soviet-Cuban declaration signed by L.I. Brezhnev and F. Castro in Havana 2 February 1974.

K.U. Chernenko briefed F. Castro on preparations underway in the Soviet Union for the 26th CPSU Congress and on the tasks currently being tackled by Soviet communists and all the Soviet people. He congratulated F. Castro on the splendid results of the second congress of Cuban communists, which outlined new targets in socialist building and formulated the party's political line for the next 5 years.

The exchange of views on current international issues reaffirmed the complete concurrence of the two parties' positions and their determination to actively strive to strengthen the socialist community's cohesion and the world communist movement's unity, to do everything to help deepen collaboration between the forces of socialism and national liberation and to coordinate their own actions in the struggle for peace and social progress.

The meeting, which took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere, was attended on the Cuban side by Raul Castro, second secretary of the PCC Central Committee. Taking part on the Soviet side were: V.I. Dolgikh, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.K. Kirichenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Odesskiy Obkom, and V.I. Vorontnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the Republic of Cuba.

On the same day the K.U. Chernenko-led CPSU delegation, accompanied by Raul Castro, second secretary of the PCC Central Committee, and Julio Camacho Aguilera, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Havana Province PCC Executive Bureau, toured Havana. The delegation familiarized itself with the progress of housing construction and the prospects of further developing the Alamar construction project outside Havana. The CPSU delegation also paid a call on the children in the Jose Marti Pioneer Camp.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS TIKHONOV FUNERAL ORATION

A comparison of the item entitled "Kosygin Funeral Ceremony in Red Square Reported" and subtitled "Tikhonov Address" published on page R 2 of the 23 December Political & Social Developments section of the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT with the text of N.A. Tikhonov's funeral oration published on page 1 of the Morning Edition of Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 24 December reveals the following variations:

On page R 2, the first line of the first paragraph of the IZVESTIYA version reads: [Text] Dear comrades, today the....

On page R 2, line 3 of the first paragraph, IZVESTIYA reads: "conscious" instead of "conscientious."

On page R 2, line 4 of the second paragraph, IZVESTIYA reads: "in working life and worked in the consumer cooperative system in Siberia. In ...."

On page R 2, line 6 of the second paragraph, IZVESTIYA reads: "party he gained tempering, practical experience and ...."

On page R 2, lines 14 and 15 of the second paragraph, IZVESTIYA omits: "chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars of the USSR...."

On page R 3, penultimate and last line of the last paragraph, IZVESTIYA confirms Kosygin titles as received.

BREZHNEV HONORS DYMSHITS, SHCHELOKOV, PAVLOV

LD301336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 30 Dec 80

[Text] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, today presented at the Kremlin Orders of Lenin and Gold Hammer and Sickle medals of Heroes of Socialist Labor, to Dymshits, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Shchelokov, USSR internal affairs minister; and Pavlov, administrator of affairs in the CPSU Central Committee.

In presenting the awards, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev gave a speech. He said:

Dear comrades. Today I have the pleasant duty of presenting lofty awards of our homeland to outstanding figures of our party and state, my long-standing and good comrades in work. By a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the title of Hero of Socialist Labor, with the presentation of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Hammer and Sickle Medal, is merited by:

Veniamin Emmanuilovich Dymshits, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, for great services to the Soviet state, and in connection with his 70th birthday.

Nikolay Anisimovich Shchelokov, USSR internal affairs minister, for great services to the Soviet state, and in connection with his 60th birthday.

Georgiy Sergeyevich Pavlov, administrator of affairs in the CPSU Central Committee, for great services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state, and in connection with his 70th birthday.

What would I like to say in connection with these awards?

Veniamin Emmanuilovich Dymshits has made a great contribution to our economic growth. He was an active participant in the creation of a number of major metallurgical works.

In difficult but glorious years of postwar rebirth, I had to work with him hand in hand in rebuilding the Zaporozhstal works, and later Comrade Dymshits, fulfilling the instructions of the homeland, helped our Indian friends to build the famous works at Bhilai, and all these years, as well as later, in work in central government organs, he was noted for his enthusiasm in his work, his talent for organization and persistance in solving the tasks set. I am certain that it will be so in the future.

Nikolay Anisimovich Shchelokov, I have also known for a long time. He worked in many sectors which were allotted to him by the party and everywhere he manifested a creative approach, rich in initiative, a broad--I would have said a statesmanlike--approach to the matter. At present, Comrade Shchelokov finds himself in quite a responsible post. His activity is connected with the insuring of a quiet and secure life for the Soviet people, with the struggle for elimination of phenomena which hinder our advance on the path of communist building. In this important sector Comrade Shchelokov has already achieved a great deal. This is evidenced by the award being presented to him. However, a great deal more has to be done and I would like to wish him new, great successes in this responsible matter.

Georgiy Sergeyevich Pavlov is well-known as a worker in the country and the party. He has undergone a great labor and ideological tempering. At present, he has a serious responsibility to shoulder, for the correct utilization of the material resources of our party, and he is fulfilling his duties with honor, approaching things not only as an able administrator, but precisely as a party worker, with the full understanding of the political significance of his activities. He has done a great deal for the creation of favourable material conditions for the ideological activity of our party organs at the center and locally in order to ensure the necessary conditions for the work, welfare and rest of party cadres. Let us wish him new achievements in this sphere.

In presenting these awards I ask you, dear comrades, to also accept my heartfelt congratulations.

In reply, Comrades Dymshits, Shchelokov and Pavlov expressed heartfelt gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Soviet Government and personally to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, for the high evaluation of their work. They assured him that all their efforts, knowledge and practical experience will be further applied to the common cause, the building of a communist society in our country.

Those present at the presentation of the awards, Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Georgadze, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Aleksandrov, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and other comrades, heartily congratulated the recipients and wished them further successes for the good of the country of the soviets.

KUZNETSOV PRESENTS AWARDS TO LEADING PERSONALITIES

LD262016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1445 GMT 26 Dec 80

[Text] Today in the Kremlin, Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented USSR decorations to a large group of recipients. The Order of Lenin and the Gold Hammer and Sickle medal of Hero of Socialist Labor were presented to Academician Kolotyrkin and People's Artist of the USSR (Kryuchkov). The Order of Lenin was conferred upon Dmitriyev, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; Academician Dorodnitsyn; Army General (Kurotkin); Prokofyev, USSR education minister; and Khitrov, USSR rural construction minister. Also received were orders of the October Revolution, the Red Banner of Labor, the Friendship of Peoples, the Red Star, the Badge of Honor, certificates of confierment of the honorary titles of USSR People's Architect, People's Artist, People's Painter, certificates of conferment of military titles, and badges of excellence of army general and artillery marshal.

MINISTER NAMED TO NEW AGRICULTURAL MINISTRY

LD291621 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 80 p 2

[Unattributed report: "At USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has formed a union republic USSR Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming [plodocvoshnogo khozyaystva].

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Nikolay Timofeyevich Kozlov as USSR minister of fruit and vegetable farming.

SAKHAROV LETTER TO SCIENCE ACADEMY HEAD PUBLISHED

DW300916 [Editorial Report] Bonn DIE WELT in German on 30 December 1980 on pages 4 and publishes the approximately 7,000 word "Open Letter" which Soviet dissident Prof Andrey Sakharov wrote to Anatoliy Petrovich Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, on 20 October 1980.

In this letter Sakharov reviews aspects of his own and other cases of adverse treatment by Soviet authorities and asks Aleksandrov to reply in an open letter as well, but with "genuine arguments" and not as the academy did when it denied him participation in its session in March 1980.

The major part of Sakharov's letter is devoted to his attitude toward topical issues and conditions in the USSR. He says that the USSR state leaders obviously seek to prevent "a major war." yet in their practical foreign policy they are guided by "an extremely dangerous strategy of strength and expansion which, in my opinion, is a 'geopolitical' strategy, and by the efforts to keep the potential adversary down and to subvert him morally. But by the moral subversion of the 'adversary' we disintegrate the world in which we live."

In Sakharov's view the avoidance of thermonuclear was is "the most important task and ranks absolute priority over all other problems of our life." Disarmament, an "actual and not just demagogic" disarmament, is possible only on the basis of a strategic balance of forces, he says.

Sakharov, who supports SALT II and advocates SALT III declares that "I would condemn as extremely dangerous the attempt by the West to seek essential strategic superiority over the USSR. Yet, I am also most profoundly concerned about the militarization of the USSR and the destruction of the strategic balance by the Soviet side in Europe and in areas of Africa and Asia, about dictates and about the Soviet demagogy in these countries."

Sakharov draws attention to the "cynicism" with which civil and political basic rights are being violated in the Soviet Union and declares that "without the grant of these rights society is 'closed' and mankind doomed." He says quite a few people in the country are aware of the need for profound economic and social reforms in the USSR, yet their implementation meets with the resistance on the part of the ruling bureaucracy and everything remains unchanged. "Meanwhile, the military-industrial complex and the KGB gain in power, threaten stability throughout the world, and the excessive militirization is devouring all resources."

KIRGIZ SSR PAPER REVIEWS CHERNENKO BOOK

LD220837 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian on 30 November 1980 publishes on page 3 under the rubric "Experience, Practice, Style" a 2,000-word review by A. Vasilchenko, first secretary of Chuyskiy Raykom, entitled "Link With the Masses Is the Guarantee of Successful Work." It is a review of the new book by K.U. Chernenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, entitled "Questions of the Work of the Party and State Apparatus."

KUNAYEV SPEECH AT KAZAKH PARTY PLENUM REPORTED

WA311652 Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 80 pp 1, 3-4

[Speech by D. A. Kunayev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee: "Tasks of the Republican Party Organization to Carry Out the Decisions of the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the Positions and Conclusions Exposed in Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's Speech at the Plenum"]

[Text] Comrades!

At our plenum today we must sum up some of the results of the work of the ongoing five-year plan and determine specific measures for successful implementation of the tasks assigned by the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech at that Plenum.

As is known the October Central Committee Plenum approved drafts of plans for the country's economic and social development and budget for 1981, which were then approved by the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and became law. Its implementation is directed towards further strengthening of the country's economic and defensive might and improvement in the standard of living of the Soviet people.

In a brilliant Plenum speech which elicited an enormous international effect, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, with his typical adherence to principle and sincerity, characterized the situation, the main results of the 10th Five-Year Plan, clearly delineated the tasks for the near future, and pointed out specific ways to realize them. It was pointed out at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that the past 4 years of the five-year plan convincingly affirmed the correctness of the economic strategy developed by the 25th CPSU Congress. Realization of this program resulted in a rise in the country's economic and defense potential. It is clearly evident from the heights reached how confidently our homeland moved ahead in all spheres of economic, sociopublic, and cultural life. Along with colossal growth in the all-union economy, science, and culture, the prosperity of the people increased noticeably and the real incomes of the people rose. Already 80 percent of urban inhabitants have individual apartments. Pension support for workers in a number of sectors of the national economy improved, as did the material-domestic conditions of Great Patriotic War veterans. Housing construction continues on a large scale. Significant measures have been taken to protect the environment and for rational use and regeneration of natural resources.

All this again shows that our party has no other concerns besides the interests and good of the workers, a rise in the standard of living of the Soviet people, in the might of the country and of the entire socialist fraternity, and the strengthening of a just peace throughout the entire world. All these tasks again were placed by the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the focus of party activities.

Implementation of the Plenum decisions will be based upon further improvement in the efficiency of the economy and intensification of all public production. The farsighted and wise program passed by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum will occupy a special place in the history of our party and people. In his speech Leonid Ilich Brezhnev emphasized that the party is en route to its 26th Congress in close unity with the people, is en route with a precise program of actions in the field of domestic and foreign policy.

The people of Kazakhstan, along with all the Soviet people, fully approve and support this policy, which is purely Leninist in spirit and action. They do so because they know well that our forward movement to a bright future--communism--is closely linked to it.

The report is published in abbreviated form.

Along with the entire country, the workers of Soviet Kazakhstan are completing the 10th Five-Year Plan successfully.

The high labor and political enthusiasm elicited by the national celebration of the glorious 60th anniversary of the Kazakh SSR and the Kazakhstan Communist Party facilitates this greatly.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's participation in the celebrations, his profound speech at a meeting of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, his speech about the program in Alma-Ata, the advice and positions expoused--all this imparted a special effective impulse to our efforts to conclude the 10th Five-Year Plan.

The plan's preliminary results are gratifying. The national income since the beginning of the five-year plan rose 23.6 percent, having now reached R19.3 billion. The volume of industrial production during this time increased almost 20 percent and this year exceeded R22 million. We in the republic have accelerated development of the vital sectors of industry which determine technical progress--electric power, machine building, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, and the fuel industry.

Almost all territorial industrial complexes are developing at accelerated rates. A number of new sectors of industry have been created, including production of plastics, industrial rubber articles, ball bearings, building tiles, and ceramics.

Manufacture of more than 700 new types of industrial products, 150 of them for the first time in this country, has been assimilated.

More than 200 new enterprises, large shops, and productions have joined the ranks of the producers. This includes the Novodzhambulskiy Phosphorous and Pavlodar Petroleum Processing plants, the plastics plant in Shevchenko, the Zhezkent and Zhayrem Mining and Enrichment combines, the Tenteksaya Mine, the coking battery at the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine, the first two units of the Ekibastuz GRES-1, and the Bogatyr open pit, the largest in the world with a capacity of 50 million tons of coal per year.

Manufacture of consumer goods rose and their quality improved.

Integrated solution of economic and social problems, something characteristic for all the oblasts in Kazakhstan, is a special feature of the five-year plan that is drawing to a close. More than R7 billion have been directed towards improvement in the housing and cultural-domestic conditions of the republic's population. During the five-year plan more than 30 million square meters of housing were commissioned. This means an improvement in the living conditions of 3.2 million people.

Many schools, children's institutions, hospitals, polyclinics, clubs, and enterprises for trade, public catering, and consumer services have been built.

The retail commodity turnover volume in state and cooperative trade increased 23 percent.

Much has been done in the sphere of transport, communications, and road construction. Thus, for example, freight hauling rose by a factor of more than one-third. The Central Siberian Rail Mainline, one of the largest in the country and contiguous to the republic's northern virgin lands regions, went into operation.

The republic concludes the five-year plan with good achievements in the field of science and culture, of artistic creativeness in many genre, the press, TV and radio, and publishing.

Agriculture occupies one of the leading positions in the republic's economy. Its share in national production is considerable and grows year by year.

Thus, for example, average annual grain production as compared to the Ninth Five-Year Plan increased in the republic by 26 percent and reached 27.4 million tons. In 5 years the state obtained 4.987 billion poods of grain, or 233 million poods above the plan.

Tasking for procurements of strong varieties of wheat was overfulfilled by a factor of 1.5.

Special note should be made of this year's harvest success. Although harvest conditions were cause for some concern, the word given to Leonid Ilich--to sell the state a new billion poods of grain for the fourth time this five-year plan--was honorably fulfilled.

Here, the grain growers of all grain-sowing oblasts in the republic fruitfully labored, but those who especially excelled were the laborers of:

--Kustanayskaya Oblast, who provided 50 million poods of grain above the plan;

--Kokchetavskaya and Severo-Kazakhstanskaya oblasts, who each provided 40 million poods;

--Pavlodarskaya, who provided 12.6 million;

--Chimkentskaya, 7.5 million poods of grain;

--Aktyubinskaya, 4 million poods;

--Kzyl-Ordinskaya, 3 million poods;

--Taldy-Kurganskaya, 1.7 million poods;

--Vostochno-Kazakhskaya, 600,000 poods;

--Alma-Atinskaya, 100,000 poods of grain.

The republic fully provided for the seeds needed for next year's crop.

Kazakhstan successfully coped within the plan for this year and for the five-year plan as a whole where procurements of grain corn, rice, seed cotton, potatoes, vegetables, and melon crops are concerned.

Positive changes occurred in animal husbandry. The average annual volumes of sales of milk, eggs, and wool to the state rose. Livestock productivity increased, as did the number of livestock. The average large-horned cattle weight yield this year is 412 kilograms, 13 kilograms more than last year.

The successes in farming and in other sectors of the rural economy were the result of the growing proficiency of rural workers and the skillful use of the continual assistance rendered to us by the party and the government, by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally.

As a result of the practical realization of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, of the inspired labor of the working class, rural workers, and people's intelligentsia, D. A. Kunayev said, we have created a reliable foundation for further accelerated development of the republic's multisector economy, science, and culture.

Further the speaker characterized the main trends in the development of the republic's national economy in the first year of the new five-year plan and cited the specific figures envisioned by the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Kazakh SSR for 1981.

The volume of the republic's budget for financing the national economy and social development is R8.769 billion.

The volume of industrial production throughout the republic next year must exceed R23 billion, or 4.4 percent more than anticipated this year. At the same time a growth in the industrial product equal to almost R1 billion must be obtained through expansion, reconstruction, and technical upgrading of extant and assimilation of previously commissioned capacities.

The highest growth rates are anticipated in electric power, the chemical, petrochemical, and fuel industry, machine building and metal processing, and the food and combined feed industry.

Ahead for each of the sectors of industry is the commissioning and assimilation of new large capacities, to raise quantitative, and mainly qualitative, indicators as required in the decisions of the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The program rural workers are faced with implementing is considerable. In farming a number of measures must be taken to further increase crop yield, to improve the rise in animal husbandry output, to eliminate extant manifestations of poor management and carelessness.

The volume of gross agricultural output next year must exceed R9 billion.

The republic has been tasked to produce at least 28 million tons of grain and, as a minimum, to sell 15.7 tons to the state.

Purchases of livestock and poultry are envisioned in a volume of 1.5 million tons, of milk 2.4 million tons, about 2 billion eggs, and 124,000 tons of wool.

All forms of transport and communications will be developed further. A number of new airports, vehicle terminals and stations, and hundreds of kilometers of hard-surface roads must be commissioned.

Several TV stations and hundreds of kilometers of radio relay and cable communications lines are to go into operation.

The plan is to build about 6 million square meters of housing from all sources of financing, including 4.7 million from state funds. Just as before the real incomes of the population unswervedly will rise. Taking this into account retail commodity turnover is planned at a level exceeding R13 billion.

Considerable resources are being invested in development of a network of education and culture, public health and social insurance, development of physical culture, and sport, tourism, environmental protection, and well-built population centers.

Significant resources here are being allocated to each oblast and rayon center, which economically must be used together with practical solution of problems involving social development of rural locales.

The 1981 plan contains difficult and varied tasking. Accomplishment of this tasking will impact upon not only the economy of the republic but also upon that of the country, moreover upon the entire socialist community.

These, comrades, are the measure both of our debt and our responsibility to you. That is why today it is important to establish strict control in every sector of economic and cultural construction, with the help of firm control to eliminate negative moments which with all frankness were pointed out at the October (1980) Central Committee Plenum.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev began his speech at the Plenum with a problem of extremely vital importance--improvement in the supply of foodstuffs for the population. The foodstuffs program now being developed by decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo will become an organic part of the upcoming five-year plan.

This long-term program will tie together problems of a further growth in agriculture and the sectors of industry serving it, all links of production output, and product processing, transport, storage, and distribution. Realization of these cardinal tasks firmly will be based on a radical intensification of all public production.

The Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Bureau tasked the republic's Council of Ministers, Gosplan, ministries, and departments to develop the corresponding program in the republic and our proposals for national authorities.

Solution of the large complex of problems linked to a foodstuffs program is senseless without further comprehensive development of the rural economy, something the Central Committee Plenum pointed up again with a great deal of severity and demandingness.

Therefore the successes we discussed today must not lull us.

The specific tasks for next year briefly were mentioned above. We must bring the gross grain yield to 28 million tons. This is a completely reasonable task. The results from this five-year plan convincingly confirm the capability to accomplish this. The country received from Kazakhstan 81.7 million tons of grain, or an average of almost 1 million poods of grain per year. The annual production here was 27.4 million tons.

The October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum levies new tasks on us. Next year and for the foreseeable future we are obliged to strengthen and develop that which has been achieved in agricultural output in order to achieve the reliable guaranteed supply of foodstuffs to the population and agricultural raw materials to industry.

All this means better, more efficient use of land and of the great material-technical and financial resources which the state is allocating.

Increased grain production remains our main task. We must unswervedly follow Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's instructions for a decisive increase in yield through improving farming culture if we are to cope successfully with this task each year. We have the capabilities for a steady growth in grain production. Beginning next year farms are to be provided new equipment. Fertilizer deliveries are increasing. Overall, as already stated, R2.9 billion are earmarked for integrated development of the republic's agriculture. We must add the rich know-how of progressive kolkhozes and sovkhozes to all of this and unite in deeds this know-how with the practice of all the farms in the republic.

Increasing the gross grain harvest and the production of strong and hard varieties of wheat, we must radically raise the production of pulse and groat crops--polygonum and millet, rice, cotton, sugar beets, vegetables, potatoes, and fruits. There was a good vegetable and potato harvest in the republic this year. This results must be strengthened and we must go even further.

Special attention should be devoted to irrigated lands which to date are not fully being put to use. This certainly does not pertain to every oblast. However the point is not to list them, but rather is decisively to eliminate shortcomings, to not allow an ineffective or huckster-like attitude towards the land, as was the case on several farms in Dzhambulskaya Oblast. Here valuable irrigated land was turned over to speculators for lease.

Things are far from all right on the irrigated lands in several rayons of Semipalatinskaya, Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya, and several other oblasts. For example, less rice was harvested than could have been in Alma-Atinskaya Oblast.

The time has come to talk realities with those who are neglecting the indubitable advantages of land reclamation, progressive agricultural technology, and the high culture of agricultural output.

The October CPSU Central Committee Plenum placed special attention on animal husbandry problems, meat production primarily.

Much has been done in animal husbandry. Many farms in Kustanayskaya, Kokchetavskaya, Tselinogradskaya, and other oblasts made a considerable contribution to development of the sector. But, unfortunately, overall throughout the republic not everywhere were people able to improve productivity and to increase the number of livestock and poultry.

Many oblasts remained in considerable debt to the state where meat procurements were concerned.

The situation with milk is somewhat better, but nonetheless this year Dzhambulskaya,

Severo-Kazakhstanskaya, and Senipalatinskaya oblasts reduced cow productivity.

Many farms in Alma-Atinskaya, Vostochno-Kazakhstanskaya, Aktysubinskaya, Tselinogradskaya, and Uralskaya oblasts are not fulfilling the five-year plan for milk deliveries.

There are many shortcomings in sheep husbandry.

The time has come decisively to eliminate the situation; moreover, conditions for accelerated development of entire animal husbandry sectors can be created everywhere.

We should more widely rely on positive know-how in meat and dairy cattle husbandry in many rayons. The acquisition this year of 17 million lambs creates good prerequisites in sheep husbandry for achievement of the goals Leonid Ilich Brezhnev established.

In all certainty it will be useful to revert to the decisions we have already made concerning animal husbandry. We all with complete acuteness, detail, and scope already levied tasking for further improvement in the sector, for strengthening of its feed base, for development of private and personal plots, for livestock servicing, and other problems. Things are going well in those places where the adopted decrees are being carried out.

Some conclusions from this, comrades. We must strictly monitor implementation of our own decisions. We possess everything required for this.

For example, for wintering livestock this year there is sufficient feed gathered, buildings are better prepared than has been the case, and the problems of mechanizing the farms and assigning enough cadres are being addressed. All this provides the opportunity successfully to winter the livestock without a loss of livestock and a drop in their productivity.

Now the job at hand is decisively to raise the responsibility of workers and of all elements and to insure a radical improvement in animal husbandry, in other sectors of agriculture.

In a word, there is nothing minor and unclear in all of these problems. Their solution must be under the active control of the party so as, in the final analysis, effectively to facilitate the creation and realization of the foodstuffs program on a republic and on a national scale.

Stemming from party directives, we are obliged to run the rural economy profitably. Nevertheless in the republic there still are farms and even rayons where capital investments grow but product output marks time.

The time has now come decisively to step up the struggle for production profitability, to learn how to count money, to cease allowing the mismanagement that is the watchword, for example, for Sergiopolskiy Sovkhoz in Semipalatinskaya Oblast or Progress Sovkhoz in Karagandinskaya Oblast.

The situation with cadre turbulence remains complex. This year three sovkhoz directors who were involved in machinations were fired in Gvardesykiy Rayon, Taldy-Kurganskaya Oblast. The control and auditing service was set up poorly in the republic's Ministry of Finance; departmental audits were even worse.

Naturally one can find convincing explanations for any omissions. But the party, the country, and the people require specific deeds, not explanations. The situation dictates the necessity to deal in the most decisive manner with lagging farms and bring them up to snuff. This is the foremost task of party authorities, of all upon whom the situation in the rural economy depends.

And another thing. Our state is rich but its generosity is not infinite. And strengthening it requires effective labor, not requests to reduce plans. Moreover the plans are absolutely realistic. There can be no other way.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's high rating given to the labor of Kazakhstanites at the October CPSU Central Committee Plenum and in his greeting to the republic's rural workers in honor of the new billion oblige us to work with greater effort, to guarantee unconditional fulfillment of all tasks established in the rural economy sphere.

Now concerning the work of our industry. As already noted production volume is going to rise next year more than 4 percent, having exceeded the R23 billion level. Here the production volume in the chemical industry is going to rise 18 percent, in the petrochemical industry 11 percent, and 10 percent in machine building. We must increase the processing of mineral fertilizers almost 27 percent.

The year's serious task is increasing the capacities at enterprises in ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, a radical step-up in construction of Shop 6 at Karmetkombinat [Karaganda Metallurgical Combine], and commissioning of the first section of the Chimkent Tire Plant.

Next year the republic's industry must not only cope with intense plan tasks, but also significantly exceed them.

Primarily we must undoubtedly fulfill this year's plan, having insured a planned transition to realization of next year's taskings.

In volumes they are large, but they are completely realistic. It is possible and necessary to realize this program primarily through a rise in labor productivity, more complete and effective assimilation of capacities, introduction of new equipment and technology, vitilization of socialist competition, and overall creation of the proper conditions for labor and leisure.

It is important to guarantee unconditional plan fulfillment by every enterprise and the rhythmic operation of every sector right from the outset.

Recently the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee examined the work the Dzhambul party obkom did to direct enterprises in the chemical industry. As analysis showed, capacities to produce phosphorous were not tasked fully due to weak direction and unsatisfactory work organization. This situation requires correction.

It also is important to improve the work in the republic's Mintsvetmet [Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy] system. Here design capacities have not been assimilated at many industrial installations commissioned during the 10th Five-Year Plan, including the Tishinskiy, Orlovskiy, and Novo-Zolotushinskiy mines and Dzhezkazgan Shaft No 65.

The use of commissioned capacities requires improvement at the Tselinograd Pig Iron Foundry and Uralsk Machine Shop and in metallurgical production at the Pavlodar Tractor Plant.

As already noted, along with accelerated assimilation of commissioned capacities and operating equipment, a rise in labor productivity is an important reserve in industrial production. During the years of the 10th Five-Year Plan, its rates of growth based on TsSU [Central Statistical Administration] data were somewhat lower than during previous five-year plans.

Mintyazhstroy [Ministry of Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises], Minmontazhspetsstroy [Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work], and the ministries of light, food, meat and dairy industry, and rural construction did not fulfill the five-year plan for this indicator.

There are great reserves for improving labor productivity in Vostochno-Kazakhskaya, Semipalatinskaya, Mangyshlakskaya oblasts and in Karagandaugol' Association, recently prominent throughout the country for record indicators.

The proportion of manual labor slowly is dropping in several sectors. This situation primarily is a result of a conservative approach to introduction of the best examples of domestic and foreign equipment and new technology.

"Regardless of the sector of work you choose," Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev underscores, "everywhere you see enormous capabilities, enormous reserves for successful movement forward."

These words also fully are applicable to Kazakh industry, which can and must do better.

In order to guarantee this by deeds we must exert all our efforts in a decisive struggle for a radical decrease in the number of lagging enterprises, more complete assimilation of commissioned capacities, and an unswerving rise in labor productivity.

It is important in every sector more actively to introduce new equipment, steadfastly to disseminate leading know-how, to improve labor productivity and control, decisively to eliminate any violation of plan and labor discipline, unswervedly to adhere to a regimen of economy and conservation, to do everything so that our multisectorial industry is at the level of the tasking set down by the party. Party committees at all levels, especially enterprise primary party organizations, and party raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms are obliged to play the determinant role in this.

I would like to say a few words about work under winter conditions. Due to the strained balance of fuel and energy resources, their economic consumption is acquiring special significance. Several ministries this year insured that these resources were rationally used. Mintsvetnet, Minpromstroymaterialov [Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry], the Soyuzfosfor Association, and those enterprises where overconsumption of fuel and electric power still is permitted should follow this example.

Discussing the most urgent tasks, one should remember that Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the meeting of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, in a speech at the celebrations in Alma-Ata, and in a speech at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum especially accentuated the importance of major shortcomings and omissions in capital construction and pointed out ways to surmount them. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's instructions for us are a combat program.

Construction of the tin plate shop at the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine is causing serious concern. In spite of assistance provided, things are not all that brilliant. The Karaganda party obkom must insure that there is a fundamental change, recalling that Leonid Ilich personally assigned the task of completing construction of the shop as rapidly as possible.

You know how much concern was expressed at the November (1979) CPSU Central Committee Plenum about construction of the Ekibastuz Fuel and Power Complex. The situation now is straightening out gradually, but under no condition can we be complacent. Soon we must place in operation the third and fourth power units at GRES-1 and turn over units five and six for operation during 1981. It is important that the Pavlodar obkom and local party authorities concern themselves about creating the conditions required for labor and leisure, which require a great deal of improvement in Ekibastuz. For example, not a single ruble has been assimilated this year at the House of Leisure in Ekibastuz, now in its second year of construction.

A number of obkoms still are not placing the requisite attention on construction of Group B installations. This is the Vostochno-Kazakhstanskiy obkom. The finishing factory at the silk combine, housing, and the oblast's children's facilities remain beyond its attention.

This is the Semipalatinsk obkom, which is not monitoring construction of a separate shop with imported equipment for production of leather jackets.

This is the Dzhambul party obkom, which completely dropped from its purview problems of housing and cultural-domestic construction primarily for workers in light industry.

Installations of the light, food, meat and dairy, and local industries are among the most important 1981 construction sites. They include the Aktyubinsk Wool Primary Processing Factory, dairies in Sary-Agach, Arkalyk, Semiozernoye, Kentau, and other locations, a Pepsi Cola production shop in Alma-Ata, and others. Their construction is part of the party foodstuffs program and must be brought under special control.

Activities of the Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry deserve sharp criticism. The work of several cement and brick plants is the cause of very serious alarm. Their production regularly comes up short, which impacts upon vital construction sites. The ministry's collegium should overcome this lag in the most decisive manner.

Much needs to be done in rural construction, including in acquicultural construction. Moreover it is right here that more often one encounters dilution of resources, a low level of work organization, padding, and eyewash.

Non-existent installations at the third section of the Yermak Poultry Factory were accepted with a "good" rating and enormous bonuses were paid for them. Li, deputy chief of Glavptitsprom [Main Administration of the Poultry Industry]; Vaytsekhovskiy, factory director; and Pasko, director of Trust No 5 in Minselstroy [Ministry of Rural Construction] were involved in the sham.

Such facts are impermissable.

As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev especially emphasized in his Plenum speech, as usual problems of housing and cultural-domestic construction, both urban and rural, must be in the center of our attention. Next year about 5 million square meters of housing, many trade and municipal services installations, kindergartens, hospitals, polyclinics, clubs, and libraries are to be built with state capital investments.

It should be stated forthrightly that everyone is being provided resources for construction but, with the exception of Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast, these resources are being assimilated poorly. This can't continue. Special attention must be paid to these problems of vital importance to the peope. Work quality must be upgraded everywhere. All this involves not only builders directly, but the republic's Gosstroy and its authorities.

Beginning next year builders' labor will be compensated for not by the volume of assimilated capital investments, but by the installations put into operation and capacities turned over for use. Therefore the annual capital construction plan must be refined by the republic's Gosplan and by the applicable ministries and departments in order to insure equal assimilation of resources and, the main point--timely and qualitative placement of all intended installations in operation. In this connection great responsibility falls on the republic's Gossnab and all of its subunits locally.

A leading place in next year's plans goes to further development of transport, communications means, and road construction. These are very important sectors and their operations determine the state of the national economy. Therefore we are obliged to learn from extant negative phenomena in transport, especially rail transport, and to take measures for a radical improvement in this area.

In addition, we should improve the use of the republic's cargo truck inventory, which is developing exceptionally intensively. Considering the special significance of highways, we are obliged even more actively to carry on their construction both from the state budget and from local funding.

Much work lies ahead in rapidly developing civil aviation. It is necessary here to accelerate expansion of the production base and the airport network and to guarantee complete flight safety.

It is also important further to develop means of communications and TV, especially telephone communications in rural locales, and to improve mail communications.

Our scientists and all who work in science are doing a great deal to carry out the urgent tasks the 25th CPSU Congress levied. The republic's Academy of Sciences alone since the beginning of the five-year plan passed on to ministries and enterprises more than 300 recommendations with a possible economic impact exceeeding R150 million.

There are a number of solutions and inventions new in principle in the creative account belonging to Kazakhstan's science.

A number of scientific forums on a national and on a world scale were conducted in the republic.

However it should be stated that sometimes the efforts of the scientists do not provide full return and sometimes are for naught. Unfortunately much research still is vague and unpromising, divorced from practical needs, and has no theoretical value at all.

On the other hand there also are other cases when producers are ignored by science. That is why certain of our sectors considerably lag behind national indexes where introduction of new equipment and placement of integrated mechanical and automatic lines and electronic computers into operation are concerned.

At the 12th Plenum of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee (December, 1979) comrades Musin, Yerzhanov, Ibragimov, Alibayev, Ivanov, Nadanbayev, and other leaders severely were criticised for poor use of extant and weak introduction of new equipment. However far from all drew the requisite conclusions from the criticism.

Moreover in a number of places they adopt a bureaucratic attitude toward unconditionally useful innovations, as was the case with Alma-Ata inventor V. S. Pavlichenko. A method he devised promises considerable gasoline economy, but the Institute of Mining in the Academy of Sciences and the republic's Ministry of Motor Transport are extremely slow to act in this matter.

It is time, comrades, radically to alter the attitude towards such people and towards achievements of scientific and technical progress overall.

Now--and this with all clarity was underscored at the October Central Committee Plenum--problems of further improvement in the quality of work and production, the expansion and renewal of its selection, are especially severe. During the 10th Five-Year Plan output of articles bearing the state Mark of Quality increased by a factor of 4. Now there are more than 2,000. Nonetheless we lag behind significantly in the number of highest category articles.

At the same time in a number of places products rated in the highest category in actuality are quite ordinary.

Much remains to be done to improve the quality and selection of manufactured goods. Primarily we should put on the spot, and if necessary, replace the directors of a number of enterprises which chronically produce faulty goods. This is no rarity at the Uralsk Sewing, Kustanay Shoe, and Kzyl-Arda Macaroni factories and at the Guryev Grain Combine. Only products for which there is a high demand must be supplied to trade. There is little use for the goods from the Dzhetysu and Dzhambulkozhobuv associations, the Metallist Plant in Alma-Ata, and from several furniture factories because their external appearance, the models, and colors are not attractive to anyone.

The republican administration of USSR Gosstandart and its local authorities are remaining passive in the struggle for production quality. In recent years they have not made a single suggestion. The efforts of ministries, departments, and standardization services are being coordinated poorly. Those who produce shoddy goods pay fines not out of their own pocket but from the state pocket, then continue producing such goods.

Comrades, the struggle for quality, for a comprehensive improvement in production efficiency, must become a matter of honor for all party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations, the press, and the rest of the mass media. It is time for every person to understand that this is not a temporary campaign, but the general policy of the party and everyone is obliged to implement it effectively.

Just as before we all are obliged not to let up in the work to create safe working conditions, to improve labor culture and aesthetics in industry, construction, transport, and agriculture.

Environmental protection now is becoming even more urgent. Vital legislative acts passed in recent years are permeated with concern about it. Considerable resources

have been allocated and assimilated since the start of the five-year plan and hundreds of structures and installations for purifying gases and domestic and industrial effluents have gone into operation. Land has been recultivated somewhat and the air space over industrial centers is cleaner.

However the scales and the main results from the work done still are wanting.

The struggle against air pollution is weak in Ust-Kamenogorsk, Dzhambul, Chimkent, and Temirtau. Nothing has been done about environmental protection for years in Pavlodarskaya, Uralskaya, and other oblasts. In places civic improvements for the population have been overlooked. We have no right to ignore all these problems. And it is important here for local organs of power to use all the rights and powers accorded to them.

Further Comrade Kunayev dwelled in detail on problems linked to improvement in the activities of such spheres as trade and public catering, consumer services, municipal services, and institutions of public health and culture.

Each of us sees here, the orator said, the considerable changes which have occurred since the beginning of the five-year plan. This cannot help but be pleasing, but serious deficiencies become more visible on the background of the positive.

Not every trade and consumer service enterprise is coping with the plan. In a number of places in Gurvevskaya, Kustanayskaya, Turgayskaya, Taldy-Kurganskaya, and Pavlodarskaya oblasts there often in sales are shortages of goods in everyday demand at a time when these goods are available in warehouses and bases.

The public catering network is growing slowly, especially at schools, higher educational institutions, and industrial enterprises.

Locally the "deficit problem" is being created artificially. Again first the dry goods and hosiery items disappear from the shelves, then children's clothing, toys, and so on.

The impermissability of such happenings often was pointed out to Comrade Ibragimov, Ivanov, and Tanekeyev but as usual, due to their carelessness, it often is "either feast or famine." So, Aktyubinskaya Oblast was overstocked with canned vegetables, but there were none in Dzhezkazganskaya Oblast. Dzhambulskaya Oblast had plenty of headgear, but there was little to be had in Semipalatinskaya Oblast.

How short will enterprises in the light and food industries be in supply of goods for trade as compared to the envisioned volume and selection? This year alone Minpishcheprom [Ministry of the Food Industry], measuring results in "volume" operations, only fulfilled the plan for 12 of 25 types of production.

The Ministry of Agriculture always is not fulfilling plans for supplies of selected vegetables to the trade network. Minbyt [Ministry of Consumer Services] also should radically improve the work of its system, which is the subject of many justifiable complaints on the part of the citizenry. This especially pertains to tailor shops, repair shops, and other consumer services.

Cooperative trade is not set up in the requisite manner everywhere, even though this often has been brought up to the management of Kazpotrebsoyuz [Kazakh Union of Consumers' Societies] and to local party, Soviet, and economic organs. If, let's suppose, the work of Kooperator stores in the republic's capital and in the city of Tselinograd deserve praise, analogous stores in all oblast center are far from popular. The proportion of commission trade in commodity turnover is exceptionally low in Dzhezkazganskaya, Guryevskaya, and Kustanayskaya oblasts.

"Improvement in the prosperity of the population," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the 25th CPSU Congress," is inseparable from more complete supply of the population's demand for various goods and services."

Such an important point, the speaker emphasized, given such conditions never becomes obsolete. We all must remember this at all times, insuring strict party control in

all spheres directly applicable to the daily life of the workers.

Successful accomplishment of all the tasks levied on us greatly will depend upon the level of support the party leadership gives to development of the economy, science, and culture, to the strengthening of party influence on all sectors of economic and cultural construction.

Noticeable positive changes have taken place in the activities of many party committees since the start of the five-year plan as the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress were implemented. Great attention began to be placed on organizational and political work locally, the norms of party life began to be followed more strictly, and a systematic, integrated approach to solution of various problems is being approved all the more steadfastly.

The important multiplan tasks levied by the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and personally by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev require further strengthening of comprehensive good organization and discipline.

However in a number of places one still encounters a lack of principle and shortsightedness in the selection, assignment, and indoctrination of cadres. We decisively must eliminate stifling of criticism, playing down critical presentations in the press and on TV and radio, and ignoring justifiable letters from workers.

As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "an attentive, concerned attitude towards a person must permeate the entire working style of party, Soviet, and economic organs, and of trade unions too, naturally. Such an attitude must become an immutable trait of the work of every manager--high and low level. There cannot and must not be any place in our Soviet way of life for bureaucracy, callousness, and superciliousness."

The election campaign presents a great chance comprehensively to analyze the activities of party organizations and to determine the tasking for the future. This was done on a high plane within the lower elements and in primary organizations overall.

It is important to retain and strengthen this mood also at the ongoing city and rayon, as well as during the forthcoming oblast, party conferences.

It is important that they all be conducted guided by successful accomplishment of the tasking levied by the party, guided by the struggle for a worthy greeting for the 26th CPSU Congress.

We rightfully demand a further improvement in the activeness and drive of Soviets of Peoples' Deputies, of trade union and Komsomol organizations, and of people's control authorities.

Several are slow in reforming their working style. Thus, Kazsovprof [Kazakh SSR Trade Union Council], instead of the organizations of viable socialist competition, is called upon to prepare all types of circulars and decrees. It is understandable that it is necessary to eliminate the paper style of management from the work of any authority, whose activities should be evaluated not by the quantity of intended measures, but by practical results.

Comrades!

The 10th Five-Year Plan in the history of our state quite rightfully can be called the five-year plan of socialism's great advantages guaranteed every worker by the new USSR Constitution, by the entire structure and system of the Soviet way of life.

But great rights also presuppose the precise obligations of each person to society. In this aspect party, trade union, Komsomol, and administrative authorities and the mass media are obliged comprehensively to step up the struggle against any encroachments against the public good, socialist legal procedure, and the constitutional rights of citizens.

In accordance with Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's direct instructions all of us are obliged to improve the legal regulation of economic activities, more effectively to counteract any instances of deceiving the state, padding, and theft of socialist property. We must take the most decisive, the most stringent measures against crooks, speculators, and middlemen--against anyone who thrives on dishonest labor.

The party immutably links practical implementation of its socioeconomic program with stepping up ideological and political-indoctrinational work among all strata and categories of workers, with comprehensive development of socialist competition. Now some 5.5 million people in the republic--the overwhelming majority workers--participate in competition.

However to date formalism and far-fetched initiatives are alive and well in competition organization. It would be proper if people everywhere would follow a single initiative--for everyone everywhere to do shock work, conscientiously and honorably, in the Leninist manner.

Nor are the capabilities and influence of the press, TV, radio, creative councils, and cultural institutions fully being used. Many newspapers, publishing socialist pledges and appeals, then forget about them. Such "sins" are characteristic also of several Kazakh radio and TV programs.

At present we have no problem more important than amplification of the decisions of the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech at the Plenum, and the materials from the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. All of this work must be tied in closely with specific accomplishment of economic tasks and further improvement in the workers' sociopolitical activeness.

Comrades!

Several days ago our country and all progressive humanity marked the 63rd anniversary of Great October, which made Marxism-Leninism the banner of the revolutionary struggle of all progressive people on earth. This is the seventh decade that we successfully are following the Leninist path, the glorious road of friendship and fraternity of peoples.

Time passes and the situation changes. But our party's general line remains unchanged. The predominent thing for the party always was and is--the prosperity and good fortune of the Soviet people, of our true friends overseas, a firm and just peace throughout the entire world.

There is no doubt that these goals will be paramount also for the greatest event of modern times--the forthcoming 26th CPSU Congress which we, just like all Soviet people, must greet with new convincing achievements.

That is why now it especially is important to rely on universal strengthening of discipline and concentration, effective dissemination of progressive know-how, decisive elimination of shortcomings. In this aspect each individual will find great, interesting, and useful work where it is important to apply all your skill, energy, and initiative.

It is important to disseminate the indicators of the republic's economic and social development plan to every enterprise, to every worker, to structure all our work so that every worker from the very beginning of the five-year plan knows what he is to do and for what he is responsible.

As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said at the October (1980) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the CPSU Central Committee draft "Main Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-85 and for the Period up to 1990" soon will be published for national discussion. This important party document must become an item of active universal discussion, which should take on a purposeful character so it will facilitate improvement in all economic activities.

In conclusion D. A. Kunayev said: The party's plans are the people's plans. They are not an end in themselves but a viable means so that, as before, the noble party tasking to further increase the prosperity and culture of the Soviet people, to expand and develop socialist democracy, to move confidently toward new heights in the construction of communism become a reality.

You know how difficult the international situation now is. But world events again with great conviction affirm the ever growing authority and influence of our state, of the entire socialist commonwealth in the international arena.

Profound realism, veracity, and trust in the inevitable triumph of the cause of peace throughout the entire world--this is what is characteristic of our foreign policy, the immutable success of which the Leninist Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, outstanding statesman and political leader of our time, viably guarantees.

Permit me in your name to assure the Leninist Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo, and Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally that the republic's communists and all its workers are prepared to accomplish any party mission and in a worthy manner will greet the upcoming 26th CPSU Congress.

EKRAN TELEVISION SATELLITE LAUNCHED 26 DEC

LD271044 Moscow TASS in English 1031 GMT 27 Dec 80

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec, TASS--A new television satellite Ekran was launched in the Soviet Union on Friday. It carries re-transmission equipment to beam national television programs in the decimetre have range to a network of collective reception systems. The satellite has been put in to a circular orbit, which is close to stationary, with the following initial parameters: distance from earth surface--35,554 km, period of revolution round the earth--23 hours 44 minutes, orbit inclination--0.4 degrees.

The Ekran satellite has the international index Statsionar-T.

SALYUT-6 FLIGHT CONTINUES TO PROCEED NORMALLY

LD291512 Moscow TASS English 1447 GMT 29 Dec 80

[Text] Moscow, 29 Dec, TASS--A TASS special correspondent reports from the Mission Control Centre:

The orbital research station Salyut-6 has been functioning in near-earth space for 39 months now. By 12 hours of Moscow time on December 29 it had completed 18,720 revolutions around the earth.

Under the programme, trials are continuing of onbard systems, apparatuses and equipment of the station in conditions of a long space flight.

According to the data of trajectory measurements, the station's orbital parameters are at present: maximum distance from the earth's surface--349 kilometres; minimum distance from the earth's surface-308 kilometres; period of revolution--91 minutes; inclination--51.6 degrees.

The flight of the Salyut-6 orbital station is proceeding normally. The control of the functioning of the systems and apparatuses is done by commands from the earth and by means of the onboard automatic equipment.

NORTHERN GROUP OF FORCES HEARS CALL FOR VIGILANCE

LD311103 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Dec 80 p 3

[Untitled dispatch from correspondent Lt Col A. Khorundzhiy under the general headline "Party conferences"]

[Text] Northern Group of Forces--A report on the present state of and measures to improve party political work on heightening troops' vigilance and combat readiness, improving the quality of personnel's training and education and tightening up military discipline was delivered at a party conference by Lt Gen N. Lushnichenko, member of the Military Council and chief of the group of forces Political Directorate. The delegates discussed a report by Col Gen Yu. Zarudin, commander of the group of forces, on the CPSU Central Committee draft for the 26th party congress.

The conference was addressed by Maj Gen F. Voynov, senior inspector of the Organizational Party Work Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Comrades D. Bobrov, A. Kapochkin, V. Kopylov and others. Maj Gen I. Baryshev, deputy chief of a directorate of the USSR Ministry of Defense Main Personnel Directorate, took part in the conference's work.

YEPISHEV VISITS BREZHNEV'S FORMER GARRISON

LD301621 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Dec 80 p 1

[Correspondent Lt Col V. Moroz report: "In the Garrison Where L.I. Brezhnev Served"]

[Text] Order of Lenin Transbaykal Military District--Yesterday, 22 December, Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, visited the servicemen of the garrison where Comrade L.I. Brezhnev served in 1935-1936.

Army General A.A. Yepishev visited the museum room, where documentary photographs are displayed which tell of the colorful life and tireless activity of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the USSR Defense Council. The tankmen particularly cherish the unique photographs of the time when Leonid Ilich, after graduating from the metallurgy institute, served in the Ninth Company, which trained reserve lieutenants. At the time he was entrusted with the duties of subunit political instructor. On 6 October 1936 the newspaper NA BOYEVOM POSTU wrote as follows about Comrade L.I. Brezhnev: "A communist and son of a worker, he himself is a worker from Dnepropetrovsk. His performance in training is rated 'excellent.' From the first days he has been one of the organizers of the struggle for excellent indicators in combat and political training. By his own example he has given a lead to other comrades."

The central place in the museum room is occupied by a portrait of L.I. Brezhnev and a copy of the book "Malaya Zemlya" with dedicatory inscriptions from him. Leonid Ilich presented them to his regimental companions when he visited Peschanka in 1978.

After looking round the exhibition, Army General A.A. Yepishev made the following entry in the distinguished visitors' book: "Dear comrade tankmen: I have been very interested to look round the Comrade L.I. Brezhnev museum room, with its collection of souvenir material of Leonid Ilich's service in your unit.

"The museum exhibition gives a vivid impression of the beginning of Leonid Ilich's service in the armed forces and of the sources of his wonderful qualities as an outstanding continuer of the cause of Lenin and the Great October Socialist Revolution, a loyal son of the Soviet people, an ardent figure in the Communist Party, the Soviet state and the international communist movement, a fighter for peace and social progress, and a consistent Marxist-Leninist. I thank you for keeping sacred the traditions of the older generation and learning to live and serve the motherland as your dear regimental companion has done. I wish you excellent service and a fitting greeting of our Leninist party's 26th congress.

"Army General A. Yepishev, 22 December 1980."

Afterward a cordial meeting took place with the servicemen of the company in whose barracks the museum room has been installed. The excellent-rated subunit is commanded by Snr Lt A. Shulyak, a Communist Party member. Army General A.A. Yepishev addressed the unit personnel.

TOLUBKO, PETROV, ADDRESS JOURNALISTS' SEMINAR

LD241639 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Dec 80 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Conference-Seminar of Journalists"]

[Text] A 5-day conference seminar of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA permanent correspondents representing the newspaper in military districts, fleets, groups of forces and branches of the armed forces has been held.

The seminar discussed the results of the permanent correspondents' work in 1980, tasks in preparing for the 26th CPSU Congress and tasks for the new training year.

The participants in the conference-seminar were addressed by Army General V.F. Tolubko, commander in chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces and USSR deputy defense minister; Army General V.I. Petrov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy minister of defense; Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov, commander in chief of the Air Forces and USSR deputy minister of defense; Army General S.F. Akhromeyev, first deputy chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces; Col Gen Arty Ye.S. Yurasov, first deputy chief of the Air Defense Forces; Adm P.N. Navoytsev, first deputy chief of the Navy Main Staff, and Justice Col Gen A.G. Gornyy, chief military prosecutor.

In his speech Col Gen A.D. Lizichev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, elucidate in detail urgent questions of ideological work in the army and navy and military journalists' tasks in 1981. In his speech Lt Gen V.I. Balakirev, chief of the Organizational Party Work Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, dwelt on questions of party work in the army and navy.

Capt A.I. Skrylnik, chief of the Press Department of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, participated in the seminar-conference of permanent correspondents.